

The CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

CONTINUING

**THE REVIEW OF HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS
RELATING TO CANADA**

(Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896)

VOL. XXXIII, No. 3, SEPTEMBER, 1952

CONTENTS

The Colonial Policy of the Whig Ministers, 1830-37: I	HELEN TAFT MANNING	203
The Earls of Durham and the Great Northern Coal Field, 1830-1880	DAVID SPRING	237
Agrarian Aspects of Early Victorian Emigration to North America	WILBUR S. SHEPPERSON	254
Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects .		265
Canada and Commonwealth Affairs	D. J. McDougall	272
Reviews of Books (<i>see following page</i>)		285
Recent Publications Relating to Canada		299
Notes and Comments		310
Mrs. R. F. McWilliams; Dr. W. I. Morse; Personal Items; Canadian Historical Association Annual Meeting; The National Library; Borden Papers; Discovery of Champlain's Astrolabe Commemorated; A New Map of New France; Institute of Early American History and Culture; Society of American Archivists; Correspondence; Our Contributors; Canadian Historical Societies		

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

KEENLEYSIDE, <i>Canada and the United States</i> : by C. P. Stacey	285
DESCHAMPS, <i>Les Voyages de Samuel Champlain</i> ; LATOURELLE, <i>Etude sur les écrits de saint Jean de Brébeuf</i> , I; <i>Les Cahiers des Dix</i> : by George F. G. Stanley	286
RASHED, <i>The Peace of Paris</i> : by Walter L. Dorn	288
HAY, <i>Arms and the Men</i> ; LINKLATER, <i>The Campaign in Italy</i> ; BUCKLEY, <i>Norway, The Commandos</i> , Dieppe: by G. W. L. Nicholson	289
WALTERS, <i>A History of the League of Nations</i> , I, II: by F. H. Soward	291
GALBRAITH, <i>The Establishment of Canadian Diplomatic Status at Washington</i> : by H. Gordon Skilling	292
MILLER-BARSTOW, <i>Beatty of the C.P.R.</i> : by G. de T. Glazebrook	293
MACGIBBON, <i>The Canadian Grain Trade</i> : by W. T. Easterbrook	294
MOWAT, <i>People of the Deer</i> : by Clifford Wilson	295
MARION, <i>Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois</i> , VII: by Richard M. Saunders	296
CONE, <i>Torchbearer of Freedom</i> : by Richard M. Saunders	297
LONN, <i>Foreigners in the Union Army and Navy</i> : by John Charles Bodger	297
GRANT and TEMPERLEY, <i>Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries</i> : by Robert A. Spencer	298

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

J. M. S. Careless G. M. Craig J. B. Conacher

ADVISORY BOARD

(To retire on December 31, 1952)

Jean Bruchési	J. A. Gibson	G. P. de T. Glazebrook
Norman Macdonald	G. W. Simpson	G. E. Wilson

(To retire on December 31, 1953)

A. G. Bailey	J.-C. Bonenfant	A. L. Burt
Chester Martin	D. C. Masters	W. L. Morton

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature*.

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Manager, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

THE COLONIAL POLICY OF THE WHIG MINISTERS, 1830-37: I*

HELEN TAFT MANNING

You expected much good from Sir George Murray; more from Lord Goderich; and you speak well of Lord Glenelg. Lords Stanley and Aberdeen, in whom you had less trust, were not long in office: but to us these ministers are all the same—their real object was and now is to nullify all that is really good in the constitution of 1791 and govern us by orders emanating from Downing Street, and by agents . . . whose best qualifications . . . (in this Province) hitherto has been that they were unacceptable to us, and violent partisans. . . .¹

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE gave voice in the passage quoted above to a sentiment which was common enough in his own day, and which has been echoed by historians and critics of the Colonial Office (the two groups, while not identical, certainly overlap) down to the present. According to the traditional view, the policy of the mother country towards the North American colonies, as embodied in the instructions and despatches from Downing Street, remained fundamentally unchanged until it was shaken to its foundations by the Canadian rebellion, and was reconstructed largely as a result of the work and the influence of Lord Durham and his able band of assistants. It is the purpose of these articles to show that this view of imperial history takes too little account of the changes in the mother country after 1830, and that, when allowance is made for the very imperfect instruments available in the shape of a colonial civil service and for the all too frequent cabinet changes in Britain; the Whig ministers of the period were moving about as rapidly as they could in the direction of colonial self-government.

Although the Whigs certainly had no coherent plan of procedure, they did have firmly held principles. They really believed in giving the colonists control over their own internal affairs, and had the colonial assemblies been able to agree as to the form of self-government they wanted, they would probably have got it between 1835 and 1837. Much of the evidence here presented is drawn from memoranda and marginal notes preserved in the bound volumes of

*This is the first of two articles on this subject by Professor Manning. The second will be published in our next issue, for December, 1952.

¹William Lyon Mackenzie to Joseph Hume, M.P., Dec., 1835, Public Archives of Canada, Q Series, 390, pt. 3, p. 510.

"original correspondence" in the Public Record Office in London, most of which were not copied for the Archives in Ottawa. Prince Edward Island is omitted from consideration, chiefly because its perennial problem of absentee landlordism did not arise elsewhere and the colony seems to have received little or no serious attention from the ministers at this time.

The credit for the reconsideration of the problems of colonial government belongs not so much to the Whigs, perhaps, as to the whole House of Commons, and in particular to the handful of independents and radicals such as Sir James Mackintosh and Joseph Hume. Even before the grievances of the Canadians became political ammunition for the aggressive wing of the Opposition, Mackintosh had created consternation at the Colonial Office by rising in House of Commons whenever the old Tory régime proposed legislation for the Canadas, in order to insist that nothing should be done without first ascertaining the views of the colonists themselves.² The sniping tactics of Joseph Hume and his band of followers called attention constantly to the fact that, whereas the ministers were pursuing an arbitrary policy of their own in administering the colonies, they were using money contributed by the British taxpayers to accomplish their sinister designs. To such arguments the Whigs and independent Tories lent a sympathetic ear, for it had long been an accepted principle of the House of Commons that British communities overseas should pay for their own governments as soon as they were able to do so, and should be allowed to legislate for themselves, as well as to tax themselves. Although the struggle over slavery had shaken the faith of many liberal-minded Englishmen in the character of the West Indian assemblies, the principles accepted in 1778 and 1791 were still applied to the North American colonies.

²It was Mackintosh who caused the withdrawal of the act reuniting the Canadas, introduced in 1822 by Robert Wilmot Horton. Andrew Cochran, who accompanied Lord Dalhousie to England in 1825, in order to assist in the preparation of the legislation which Dalhousie considered essential, wrote as follows of an interview which he had with James Stephen when Wilmot Horton was indisposed: ". . . it appeared from what he said that both Lord Bathurst and Mr. W. H. were perfectly willing to introduce anything relating to Canada into the forthcoming Bill, except taxation. But that, in order to give them a specific ground to stand upon in Parliament, it would be necessary for your Lordship to write a public despatch to Lord B. stating the different reasons for adopting each of the measures proposed, and for resorting to Parliament for that purpose, and referring to any papers or documents which might be produced in support of them; so that Mr. Canning might get a lesson upon the subject and might be able in case of necessity to come in aid of Mr. W. Horton and *rescue* him in the event of his being hard pressed by questions or opposition from Sir James Mackintosh, Mr. Hume or any other gentlemen on that side of the House." A. W. Cochran, Esq. to the Earl of Dalhousie, March 31, 1825, P.A.C., Dalhousie Papers, vol. 10.

A turning point in imperial policy was reached when William Huskisson, Colonial Secretary in 1828, attempted to meet the criticism of the Opposition by proposing a parliamentary committee to investigate the grievances of the Canadians, and the report of the Canada Committee of that year is in many ways as much of a landmark in imperial history as the *Durham Report* itself. Huskisson, whose generous views for the North American colonies had been set forth in his speeches while he was at the Board of Trade, was Colonial Minister for too short a time to master the intricate problems which faced the would-be reformer of the old colonial system; and his successor, Sir George Murray, while full of expressions of goodwill, never reached the point where he committed to paper his plan for extricating the British government from its morass of difficulties in Lower Canada, and for avoiding those difficulties for the future in the other North American colonies. It remained for the colonial secretaries in the Grey and Melbourne governments to formulate new measures.

The first principle to which the Whigs as a party were wholeheartedly committed in colonial policy was that of economy on the part of the mother country in governing the colonies. It is difficult for us of the modern world to appreciate the deep ethical and constitutional significance of the economy issue in the early nineteenth century. Aside from the fear of an income tax and other insidious encroachments by the central government on the rights of property, it was generally, and not unjustly, argued that governmental extravagance was closely connected with political corruption; that pensions and useless offices were distributed for the purpose of influencing British elections; and that no measure of parliamentary reform could be effective until the ministerial budget was pruned of excrescences and superfluities. As a source of patronage the colonies had always ranked high ("the fairest flower in the garland of the Home Office," Tierney, the Whig leader, had once called them), and it was a source which in the eighteenth century had been more or less removed from parliamentary control. But in the nineteenth century, when the civil and ecclesiastical establishments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Upper Canada were largely provided for in the parliamentary estimates, and it was well known that not only the cost of military garrisons, but also of many incidental expenses of the civil government, were taken care of from the money voted for "army extraordinaries," there was an ideal opportunity for Joseph Hume and his followers to swing into action every spring and to attack the whole system of

subsidizing the provincial governments. Since the belief was already prevalent that colonies were destined in the near future to drop from the tree like ripe fruit, there was obviously no excuse for spending so much money in governing and defending them. Moreover, as a lively correspondence developed between radicals in the House of Commons and the leaders of Opposition in the Canadas, the former were able to assure their fellow-members that the colonists only asked to be allowed to pay for their own government and to run it in their own way.

So great was the parliamentary pressure, even in Tory days, that Lord Bathurst had begun to canvass possible ways and means of financing the civil establishments without an annual vote in the House of Commons, while Sir George Murray had to promise that he would present a "colonial budget" covering the total cost of the colonies to the mother country. This promise proved to be a source of embarrassment to the Whigs when they came in to office, and was a principal cause of the rift which developed between the permanent staff of the Colonial Office and those dogmatic thinkers of the new régime who agreed with the strictures of Joseph Hume. R. W. Hay, who had been appointed Permanent Undersecretary in 1825; Adam Gordon, who owed his place to the first Lord Melville, a friend of the younger Pitt; George Baillie, of whom we shall hear more below; and several others, who eked out their meagre salaries with agencies or sinecure offices appearing on the colonial establishments, were not at all pleased with the proposal that details of those establishments should be discussed in Parliament. When William Lyon Mackenzie, in 1832, described "the old bitter Tory clerks, trembling for their enormous incomes and hating everything connected with reform,"³ he was perhaps exaggerating, but an exchange of private letters between Lord Goderich and his two undersecretaries shows that Hay at least was putting up all the resistance he could to "economical reform."⁴ From his sick-bed in the winter of 1831-2 he wrote to his chief to protest the proposal that every detail of expenditure on the government and defence of the colonies should be presented to the House of Commons in the form of a budget, and that despatches to the colonial governors should be produced as evidence of what the ministers were doing to reduce the estimates. Although Hay admitted that something

³See *Colonial Advocate*, Dec. 20, 1832. Mackenzie's letter is from London, dated October 22. It is one of a series written during his visit to England, described below, p. 228.

⁴The letters are in the Goderich Papers in the British Museum. Add. MSS. 40862, pp. 310-15, Hay to Goderich, Jan. 4, 1832; Howick to Goderich, Jan. 9, 1832.

would have to be done, since Lord Althorpe, the leader of the House of Commons, had announced during the last session that such a budget would be presented, he pleaded for a minimum of documentary material.

In this correspondence Hay represents the defensive tactics of the late Tory administration; Lord Howick (son and heir of Earl Grey,⁵ the extreme left of the Whig administration; and Lord Goderich (more Canningite than Whig), the middle way.

In regard to the expectations which have been held out by former secretaries of state . . . I think I can speak with some confidence [wrote Hay] and I am the more inclined to enter on this part of the subject, as Sir George Murray has, I find, been assumed to be the author of this embarrassing measure. . . . The first notion of this scheme was suggested when Lord Bathurst was Secretary of State for the colonies: and as the Chief object in view, at that time, was to remove the exaggerated ideas which were entertained by many as to the expense of the Colonies to the Mother Country, the utmost which was contemplated was that the Colonial Minister, or his representative in the House of Commons should make such an exposé to Parliament of the financial condition of the Colonies, as would shew what was the balance of account between them and the Mother Country. This statement was to be made in Parliament, in the same manner as the budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and was not to be accompanied by the presentation of any papers whatever.

Sir George Murray's intentions, according to Hay, had been along the same lines, and nothing but harm could come of any other policy. As to the publication of the despatches dealing with finance: "It is always a disadvantage to a Governor that, the orders he receives from Home, should be made public while they are in operation: . . . Every demagogue has it in his power to assail him, and dispute the construction put by the Governor upon the Secretary of State's orders: and I can easily conceive some cases where the success of a financial scheme may be impeded, if not altogether defeated by a premature disclosure. . . ." After urging with all the arguments at his command, and with illustrations drawn from all parts of the globe, that only enough information be presented as would be sufficient to satisfy "any reasonable man," Hay closed his letter with the gloomy prophecy that, should any other course be adopted, "I cannot but fear that it will end in placing the Government of the Colonies practically in the hands of Mr. Hume and his associates."⁶

⁵Sir Henry George Grey (1802-94), Viscount Howick, succeeded his father as third Earl Grey in 1845. In August, 1830, he was appointed Undersecretary for the Colonies in his father's administration.

⁶Goderich Papers, Hay to Goderich, Jan. 4, 1832.

Hay's letter was submitted to Lord Howick, the Parliamentary Undersecretary, who promptly took issue with him. Admitting the inconvenience of having to publish the correspondence with the North American governors while negotiations were still pending, Howick was nevertheless adamant that the fullest possible information must be given.

What were Sir George Murray's intention upon this subject I have no means of judging but I know the manner in which he expressed himself was such as to create a universal belief in the House of Commons that he would furnish in the next session [1831] the fullest detail upon the Income and Expenditure of *every* colony, this promise so understood was unexpectedly quoted against us last year and we were compelled to renew it in terms equally wide. Under these circumstances, having already had the delay of a whole year granted to us, I fear there is no alternative. . . . We are forced to produce a statement of the actual expenditure of our colonies, this unfortunately is almost universally *justly* to be reproached with extravagance, we have in many instances the reports of commissioners recommending reduced establishments, and if we have been prevented by a regard to vested interests and by a variety of circumstances from effecting at once the economical reform which it must be our object eventually to accomplish, is it not absolutely necessary to show some good reason for our delay, to give some proof beyond mere assertion that we have done all that is practicable? . . . The House of Commons has been so long amused [*sic*] by promises which have come to nothing that I am convinced it will no longer be so satisfied and that it will not listen to unsupported excuses.

Howick added that a "thick volume" of papers, which his critics were unlikely to read through, would be a great help to him in a debate, and to this his chief agreed. Howick's letter has a note from Goderich to Hay, written across the corner, which reads, "We must settle all this with Howick when you are able to be at the office. I fear we must give a good deal; and from some experience I know the benefit of *overlaying* a matter with papers."⁷

As may be seen from the phraseology of Lord Howick's letter, the Parliamentary Undersecretary was himself an ardent advocate of "economical reform" and was in fact, while he remained at the Colonial Office, the moving force for most of the changes in the administrative system. In spite of his youth and inexperience, he would appear to have exercised a powerful influence over the policies of his somewhat vacillating chief, and was certainly credited by his contemporaries with being personally responsible for the most important decisions emanating from Downing Street at this time, such as the new policy for the sale of colonial land, based on

⁷*Ibid.*, Howick to Goderich, Jan. 9, 1832.

suggestions offered by Edward Gibbon Wakefield.⁸ Howick was probably the most thoroughgoing reformer who was to appear in Downing Street for some time to come, and it was unfortunate that so much of his energy should have been turned to greater governmental economy, for his efforts in that direction, although meeting with hearty approval from Hume and his cohorts, did little to promote better relations with the colonists themselves. As was demonstrated in his later correspondence, and in his own administration of the colonies at a later day, he had a whole panoply of doctrinaire principles for the government of the colonies,⁹ all very up to date and on the whole in line with the policies which were to be put into effect after 1846; but during his first tenure of office a disproportionate amount of his time must have been spent in poring over despatches from overseas, looking for items which indicated that the British taxpayers' money was being spent on objectives which should have been paid for by the colonists themselves. Memoranda and marginal notes, signed "H,"¹⁰ addressed to his chief and to others in the department, are scattered throughout the volumes of original correspondence. In these Howick insists that the governors should not be permitted to buy or hire vessels for their own transportation, that they should not draw on the British Treasury for the support of paupers shipped to the colony from depressed areas in Ireland and Scotland, or for the upkeep of Canadian convicts sent to the hulks in Bermuda, or for any of the other extraneous items which had formerly been charged to the "military chest." Least of all was he willing that the governors should look to England for help when colonial assemblies refused to do their duty in meeting the expenses of their own civil establishments. His firm conviction

⁸Edward Gibbon Wakefield wrote: "For this great improvement they (the colonists) are more immediately obliged to Lord Howick." Quoted in A. J. Harrop, *The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield* (London, 1928), 59. The whole chapter in Harrop's volume is of interest in showing the close connection between the Wakefield reformers and the Colonial Office at this early date.

⁹See his *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration* (London, 1853).

¹⁰Howick's notes, if they are so signed, are unmistakable, since R. W. Hay used his three initials and had a handwriting which is easily recognized. Unfortunately, Howick did not always sign his marginal comments, and his handwriting is not so easily distinguished from that of Stephen and other members of the permanent office staff, as is Hay's. His style is very distinctive, however, and it seems safe to say that most of the more striking comments and memoranda in 1831-2 are his. For some of his signed memoranda see Public Record Office, C.O. 42/233, despatches 73 and 90. He also drafted or gave the directions for the drafting of many of the official despatches which were later initialled by Goderich. Many of these drafts in rough form with corrections and notes are preserved.

that colonists must be taught to pay for their government, whatever the consequences, was expressed with amusing dogmatism in a despatch which he drafted on the subject of the "contingent" law expenses in Lower Canada, where the Assembly had refused to pay the bill rendered by the Attorney-General, C. R. Ogden, for no better reason than that the members did not care for that gentleman personally. Lord Aylmer, the Governor-General, despairing of future appropriations necessary to carry on governmental prosecutions, had begged for assistance from the Crown revenues, but it was Lord Howick's view that, if criminals were allowed to roam at will in Lower Canada, the voters would soon belabour their representatives with petitions, and the Assembly would at once become more reasonable and would pay Mr. Ogden's bill. "Such Petitions," he wrote, "are the mode which the Constitution points out for correction of abuses of which the Representatives of the People may be the Authors." Perhaps some realist at the Colonial Office pointed out to Lord Goderich that the French Canadians would almost certainly prefer the presence of a few criminals in their midst to that of the English law officers; for the despatch, although approved by the Minister, was not sent, and is of interest only because it expresses the stern views of one who may be regarded as the archetype of Whig, especially where economy for the mother country was at stake.¹¹

On the positive side the efforts of Howick were chiefly turned to reducing the expense to the mother country of the civil and ecclesiastical establishments of Nova Scotia. Since in Lower Canada the Assembly had long ago expressed its willingness to carry the whole cost of the civil government, the contest with the mother country turned on the question of who should prepare the budget, and whether the more important salaries should be granted for the lifetime of the King. In Upper Canada and New Brunswick a boom in land and timber had so far increased the "casual and territorial" revenues of the Crown that their civil establishments had ceased to appear as items in the parliamentary estimates, although their assemblies had not assumed any additional responsibility for the financing of the civil governments. But Nova Scotia had seen no such increase in her revenues, and the task to which Lord Howick turned his best attention in 1832 admitted of no easy solution. Since there was almost no Crown land remaining on the mainland of Nova

¹¹See C.O. 42/237. The draft is undated and unsigned, but it is in Howick's handwriting, and is initialled by Goderich. There is discussion about it in later memoranda.

Scotia, fit for sale or rental, and the best land on Cape Breton was needed for the Highlanders who were arriving there in great numbers, the only important source of "territorial" revenue was from the coal mines, which in the twenties had provided a very comfortable nest-egg to cover emergencies in the provincial government. Seven thousand pounds had accumulated over the years, and it was this item which attracted the eye of Lord Howick when looking over the provincial accounts. It was soon discovered, however, that the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Peregrine Maitland, had promised a large part of the accumulation to the magistrates of Cape Breton to assist in the settlement of the impoverished Highlanders. Since it was contrary to the principles of the new land policy to give away any land, and since the Highlanders were apparently receiving theirs only on the strength of earlier promises, the expenditure of money on their accommodation seemed particularly heinous, and Maitland was severely rebuked.¹²

Since it was, however, apparent that the income from the coal mines, no matter how carefully husbanded, could never cover the whole cost of the civil establishment, it was necessary to explore the other possible sources of revenue. Only one seems to have suggested itself, and that was one which had been several times brought forward in the past, only to be abandoned because of universal colonial opposition—namely, the collection of the quitrents throughout the Maritime Provinces. A new argument in favour of the measure now suggested itself. It was the avowed purpose of the Whigs to give no more land away, but to sell it at auction to the highest bidder, after fixing a minimum "upset" price. It could, therefore, be maintained that colonists who had received their land free under the old system now, more than ever, owed the Crown the small rental which had been their only obligation under the terms of their grants.¹³ In principle it was easy enough to justify the measure; but the long history of quitrents in the colonies, stretching back over two centuries, offered sufficient proof that they could not be collected save under an act of the Assembly, and that any effort on the part of the officers of the Crown to collect them would be regarded as a new form of taxation and an act of tyranny.¹⁴

¹²C.O. 218/30, Goderich to Maitland, July 7, 1831.

¹³For the correspondence on the quitrents, with Goderich's, Howick's, and Stanley's comments, see C.O. 217/154-7.

¹⁴See Beverley Waugh Bond, *The Quit-rent System in the American Colonies* (New Haven, 1919). For earlier attempts to collect them in the Maritime Provinces, see H. T. Manning, *British Colonial Government* (New Haven, 1933).

Although the machinery of collection was actually set in motion in New Brunswick, and was repeatedly threatened in Nova Scotia, it seems probable that the whole procedure was really regarded as a leverage for extracting money from the assemblies for the payment of salaries. In explaining the new land policy of the colonial department to the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, it was explicitly stated that the collection of rents had never proved to be either feasible or profitable;¹⁵ and Lord Goderich and his successors were ready to abandon forever the quitrents in the Maritimes just as soon as a lump sum was granted from revenues raised by the local legislatures. Regarded in this light, the policy was at least a partial success, for the Assembly of Nova Scotia in 1834 granted £2,000 a year permanently, to be applied to the lieutenant-governor's salary. But since Goderich and Howick had also been nourishing the hope that the Assembly would voluntarily assume full responsibility for the judicial salaries, it would certainly have been more straightforward, as well as more tactful, to ask at once for the whole "civil list." The immediate outcome would perhaps not have been very different, for the people of Nova Scotia were suffering from a decline in their trade in these years, and were not confident enough about the future to assume further financial obligations. Had the negotiations been better handled, however, the Assembly would not have passed resolutions in 1833 which aligned them for the moment with the Assembly in Quebec by demanding, as a matter of constitutional right, the appropriation of "all monies paid by them for purposes of government."¹⁶

In the course of mulling over the Nova Scotia estimates Lord Howick also made a sincere attempt to reduce salaries and incidentals, even though the appointees of the Colonial Office, most of them sent out from England, would suffer. Not only were the lieutenant-governors to be deprived of various military bonuses, but their salaries were to be docked by £500. In Nova Scotia the provincial secretary's salary was also to be reduced as soon as the incumbent (an English baronet) retired. The "government vessel" was dropped from the estimates entirely. But, in spite of all his efforts, expensive items kept creeping back into colonial budgets. Sir Colin Campbell, the Lieutenant-Governor who succeeded Mait-

¹⁵Report of the Public Archives of Canada, 1935, 316. These reports will hereafter be referred to as P.A.C., Report.

¹⁶For a summary of these resolutions and an account of the proceedings of the Assembly in 1834, see the article by D. C. Harvey, "The Civil List and Responsible Government in Nova Scotia," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXVIII, Dec., 1947, 378-9.

land, would not hear of having his salary reduced, any more than he would consent to wait to receive it until the quitrents should be collected; and his influence at the Horse Guards was sufficient to induce Stanley, who succeeded Lord Goderich, to restore the old salary to the parliamentary estimates.¹⁷ As a matter of fact, the Whigs did not find it any easier than had the Tories to rid themselves of a system of patronage which had its roots in English, not colonial, politics; and they diminished their bargaining power in dealing with colonial assemblies by yielding to pressure from office-holders, some of them absentees, who insisted on retaining, without diminution, incomes which they always maintained had been granted them for life.¹⁸

The colonists were the more aroused by the efforts of the British government to foist on to them the extravagances of an earlier century, because they had their own views on governmental economy, which were by no means consistent with those of the London departments under any administration. Papineau and Mackenzie were forever lecturing their constituents on the extravagance of their civil establishments and on the merits of the American system, where salaries were low and federal revenues were actually turned over to the state governments. The Maritime Provinces in the twenties had had a spectacular demonstration of the inequity of the Imperial Government in remunerating its own officials. In return for their right to appropriate the whole revenue collected under acts of Parliament which admitted foreign shipping to colonial ports, but subjected it to discriminatory duties, the colonists had been asked to pay salaries to the British customs officers whose income in earlier years had depended on exorbitant fees bearing heavily on colonial trade. It then appeared that the collectors of customs in Halifax and Saint John had been receiving annually incomes nearly equal to those of the lieutenant-governors, and much larger than those of the chief justices. The Commissioners of Customs in London insisted that these gentlemen could not be reduced to the figure which seemed appropriate to the colonists, and the argument was still unsettled as far as New Brunswick was concerned.¹⁹ Thus there originated in the Maritimes the slogan that no official in the colony, ex-

¹⁷Colin Campbell's correspondence with R. W. Hay, and the letter from the office of the Commander-in-Chief (the Horse Guards) are in C.O., 217/156-7.

¹⁸The same had been true in Lower Canada during Lord Bathurst's administration. See H. T. Manning, "The Civil List of Lower Canada," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXIV, March, 1942, 37-40.

¹⁹For the argument in Nova Scotia over the customs salaries, see Marion Gilroy, "The Imperial Customs Establishment in Nova Scotia, 1825-1855," *Canadian Historical Review*, XIX, Sept., 1938, 277-91.

cept the lieutenant-governor, should receive an income greater than that of the chief justice, who was in both cases a native of the province, and this was used with good effect later.

If economy was the first principle in the Whig programme for the government of colonies, the redress of grievances was the second. The Canada Committee had given the stamp of its approval to most of the constitutional arguments of the Lower Canadians, and the report published in the fall of 1828 was greeted with jubilation and praise by the opponents of Lord Dalhousie in Quebec and Montreal. If its recommendations could have been carried out, they would also have taken care of the most serious grievances of the Upper Canadians, for the committee urged the liquidation of the clergy reserves and the reform of the Legislative and Executive Councils in such a manner as to free them from the domination of the official class. It was the contention of the radical group in the House of Commons that economy for the mother country and the redress of grievances for the colonists went hand in hand; that just as soon as the ministers put an end to the system of parliamentary grants and subsidies, tucked away in the "army extraordinaries," the colonists would give themselves the kind of government they wanted, and would be free of interference from Downing Street in their internal affairs. This reasoning was unquestionably sound enough from the long-range point of view, for the half-century and more of maternalism on the part of Great Britain towards her colonies had been responsible for a whole series of abuses, not the least of which was the long list of sinecures and pensions which benefited no one, except the staffs of the London offices and those officials in colonial capitals who inveighed against "democracy" as exemplified by the popular house of the provincial legislature.

Yet the effort to shift the burden of the colonial establishments suddenly, and with excessive emphasis on the budget of the mother country, led very naturally to new sources of friction. In no field was this more true than in that of the ecclesiastical and educational establishments. The Whigs were sincerely anxious to recognize the fact, which Lord Bathurst had been determined to ignore, that the great majority of the Protestants in the North American colonies were not members of the Church of England. They were entirely willing that the institutions of higher learning which had been given charters by the Crown on the model of the English universities, and were without exception languishing not only for lack of funds, but also for lack of popular support, should be liberalized and made available for all religious groups in the colonies. They had no objec-

tion to the sale of the clergy reserves and to a more equitable distribution of governmental subsidies among the various religious groups. They would even, no doubt, have been willing to dispense with a few of the English bishops who had been sent out by Lord Bathurst and his predecessors at the expense of the mother country. But bishops are not so easily disposed of, and the Whig formula of seeking sources of revenue within the colonies, which could be immediately substituted for parliamentary grants, led inevitably to new difficulties. Thus the transfer of clerical salaries in Lower Canada to the casual and territorial revenues of the Crown in that province intensified the determination of the Assembly at Quebec to gain control over those revenues, and even inspired its members to further historical research and to the discovery that Lord Dorchester, in 1793, had pledged those same revenues to the support of the civil government.²⁰

In Nova Scotia there was a frantic search for some device which would permit the bishopric to become self-supporting, or at least independent financially of the mother country. "Something must be done to secure the Bishop's Income on your side of the Atlantic," wrote Lord Goderich to Sir Peregrine Maitland. "I urge an earnest and speedy Consideration of the matter upon ground which as a sincere Churchman I feel to be essential to the well-being of our Common Church in Nova Scotia. That Establishment is in *all* Our N.A. Colonies in a crisis. If well managed it will secure her permanent & tranquil existence. If we try to maintain her by nothing but authority she will fall."²¹ The last sentence might lead one to suppose that Goderich recognized the unwise of using provincial revenues to bolster an unpopular state church and perhaps he did; but he was certainly more concerned about public opinion in England than in Nova Scotia. The annual vote of the Bishop's salary in the House of Commons was the matter which really worried him and he was not at all impressed by the cleric's plea that if the funds had to come from any provincial source the popularity of the Anglican establishment would sink to a new low. It was only because the devices (suggested no doubt by the fertile imagination of Lord Howick) for endowing the bishopric with Crown lands, or collecting enough quitrents in the province to pay the salary not only of the Lieutenant-Governor but of the Bishop as well, all proved to be impracticable, that his Grace's salary continued to appear on the parliamentary estimates.

²⁰See P.A.C., *Report*, 1931, 245, for the final despatch on the subject.

²¹C.O. 218/30, pp. 348 ff., Nov. 24, 1831.

But if their enthusiasm for the reduction of their own "colonial budget" blinded them to the new resentments they were stirring up across the Atlantic, the Whigs were at least consistent in being willing to turn over to the local legislatures responsibility for the direction of most of those enterprises for which they were asking the colonists to pay. The assemblies of Upper and Lower Canada were invited to legislate on the subject of the clergy reserves, and bills were drawn up in Downing Street and sent to Quebec and York in order to indicate the type of legislation which would be acceptable to the Imperial Parliament.²² While this may seem at first glance merely another method of keeping the colonial assemblies in leading-strings, there is no reason to suppose that any bills acceptable to both houses of the legislatures and to the governors would not have received careful consideration in Westminster. The Legislature of Upper Canada was expected to carry out the recommendations of the Canada Committee on the subject of the provincial university, and the same solution would have been applied to Nova Scotia, once the trustees of King's College and of Dalhousie College, who had agreed to the amalgamation of their institutions, could be persuaded to relinquish their charters.²³ The Whig policy on institutions of higher learning in North America was never better stated than in a memorandum for Lord Goderich, written probably by Lord Howick, but not signed, which contained the following sentences:

Nothing can be more evident than the folly of having ever attempted to create two separate Colleges in Nova Scotia. . . . The best mode in my opinion of effecting the Establishment of the proposed New College and of settling its Constitution would be to call upon the Assembly to pass an Act for the purpose; it would I suppose be necessary that the Charters of the present Colleges should in the first instance be got rid of, but I conceive that by proceeding in the same manner as it is proposed to do in Upper Canada the surrender would be obtained without any difficulty. This I think would be the most likely means of inducing the Legislature to make the necessary pecuniary provision for the maintenance of a really effective College. . . .²⁴

The sincere efforts of the Whigs to pass on the responsibility for the regulation of religion and education in North America (along with the expense) to the provincial bodies, brought them face to face with the great obstacle which was to block most of their well-meant efforts at reform down to 1837—namely, the utter inability of the governor and the two houses of the legislature in any colony to

²²Despatches on the subject are calendered in P.A.C., *Report*, 1931, 245-52; *ibid.*, 1935, 274-8.

²³See *ibid.*, 284-8; for Nova Scotia, see C.O. 218/30 *passim*.

²⁴See C.O. 217/154, pp. 171-81.

agree on fundamental changes in church or state. Everywhere, except in Lower Canada, the majority of the upper house was Anglican and had no desire to relinquish the privileged position that church had occupied since the planting of the colony. The lieutenant-governors in the English-speaking colonies were usually in complete sympathy with their councillors and, in spite of all admonitions from Downing Street, they continued to recommend for appointment to the councils men who would see eye to eye with their fellow-members on the subject of basic reforms.

Moreover, the governors were sometimes accused by the opposition leaders in the assemblies of encouraging the upper houses to reject all bills which would have introduced any real institutional changes. Lord Goderich at least would appear to have accepted this hypothesis, and he lamented over such gubernatorial interference in a somewhat helpless note to Lord Howick, written in 1832, on the subject of William Lyon Mackenzie's complaint that the laws of Upper Canada regulating juries and local assessments were out of date and needed revision: "The Assembly have I believe passed laws upon these subjects, but the Council has rejected them. The Governor ought *not* to encourage the Council in rejecting the Bills of the Assembly: they [the councillors] have a right to an independent exercise of their functions, but I fear they do not understand their relative duties in the Legislature."²⁵ Obviously the Whig Minister, after much patient effort to persuade the colonists to pass laws for their own betterment, was at his wit's end how the counterparts of the House of Lords in the American provinces could be taught that their duties should be ceremonial, and that in an era of reform they must learn to do nothing in particular and do it very well. It was a problem which had not troubled the Tories, ever willing to have the councils act as a brake on the democratic impulsiveness of the popular bodies, and it was one with which the Whigs were quite unable to cope until they had bred a new race of colonial governors.

For in the last analysis it was the governors who chose the councillors; although a governor might under pressure recommend a Roman Catholic or a Wesleyan, he was always careful that his nominee had the proper social and political affiliations. Lower Canada was really the only one of the North American provinces in which a sincere attempt was made, under Sir James Kempt, to carry

²⁵This very interesting note addressed to Lord Howick, and signed "Goderich," follows Sir John Colborne's despatch no. 3, dated Feb. 1, 1832 (C.O. 42/411). The note deals with only one of the points raised by Colborne, and is chiefly concerned with other matters which Goderich had on his mind about Upper Canada, some of which are treated below.

out the recommendations of the Canada Committee that the upper house be made more representative, as well as more independent of the administration. In 1829 and 1830 members of the pro-French party were added to the Legislative Council in sufficient numbers to enable most of the legislation passed by the Assembly in 1830 and 1831 to become law. But Lower Canada was also the province in which party strife reached a new peak in 1832, and members of the Assembly who accepted a seat in either Council were thereafter black-balled by their former political associates. In Upper Canada Sir John Colborne had complied with his instructions from Sir George Murray to the extent of appointing fifteen men of property and position to the Council in 1831, including two captains of the Royal Navy and two army colonels, and then, as a special gesture of goodwill to the Roman Catholics, he added Bishop Macdonell. But it is not apparent that the character of the upper house was greatly changed, or that the hold of the "family compact" over it was weakened.²⁶

The helplessness of the Whig ministers to bring about any real change in the character of the colonial councils, without the aid of strong governors who understood and sympathized with their policy, was clearly demonstrated in the failure of Lord Goderich's efforts to reform the constitutions of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. His plan was to separate the Executive Council from the Legislative Council, on the Canadian model, in order that the latter could be enlarged to include members from distant parts of the province, who could not have attended the more frequent meetings of the Executive Council. Moreover, he was ready to take at least the first step toward cabinet government by arranging that two members of the Executive Council, which acted in an advisory capacity to the lieutenant-governor, should be members of the Assembly. "The best mode probably of trying the experiment," he wrote in 1832, after the Governor had protested against sudden changes, "of uniting in one person the two characters, would be to endeavour to procure the election of an Executive Councillor as a Member of the Assembly instead of naming a person already in the Assembly to the Council. With this view, I think it would be advisable to take an early opportunity of introducing into the Executive Council some Gentleman possessing such an interest in some part of the Province as is

²⁶See Colborne's despatch of May 15, 1835, C.O. 42/425. Colborne must have given this information earlier in one form or another, since any such appointment had to be confirmed, and a mandamus prepared in England, but he seems to have given no description of his appointees until 1835 when he was defending himself against his critics in the Colonial Office.

likely to lead to his being chosen.²⁷ But even this cautious approach to constitutional reform was too drastic for Sir Archibald Campbell, the New Brunswick Governor to whom the despatch was addressed, and his Executive Council continued to be composed entirely of those officials who were highest in his favour, until the abrupt end of his administration in 1837.

As a matter of fact, even the innocuous and ineffective measure of separating the two Councils in New Brunswick in 1830 created such a sensation and so much hard feeling that the Governor and Council in Nova Scotia were strengthened in their determination to resist all changes. Questions of etiquette and precedence were raised which no one in England had contemplated, and resentment was aroused which the Lieutenant-Governor did nothing to assuage. Executive Councillors had to take precedence over Legislative Councillors because it was essential that one of their number should conduct the government in case of the absence or death of the Governor; and since Sir Archibald Campbell had taken the opportunity to drop from the Executive Council many aged gentlemen, some of whom may well have been appointed in the eighteenth century, the ranking member who would succeed to the government was Thomas Baillie, Commissioner of Crown Lands, the most hated man in the Province.

But if in New Brunswick the opposition to the changes proposed turned largely on personal feuds, in Nova Scotia the Council occupied a position which had been re-entrenched by years of gubernatorial favour, and which was actually stronger and less assailable than that of the more famous "family compact" in Upper Canada. The members were all from the highest circle of Halifax society, which even Sir Peregrine Maitland (certainly no democrat) admitted had not enlarged itself with the growth of the colony. Moreover, their interests were overwhelmingly commercial and financial, as proved by the fact that five out of thirteen members were directors of the Halifax bank; and since opposition to their stranglehold on the government of the province had not yet found a leader in the Assembly, the ministers in England were persuaded for the moment to let sleeping dogs lie, in what the councillors always called "this retired and peaceful province."

The chronic deadlock between the houses of the legislatures in North American provinces on all questions of fundamental reform was rendered more serious by the fact that the Whigs were deeply committed to the non-interference of the Imperial Parliament in

²⁷C.O. 188/159, no. 56, Sept. 25, 1832.

colonial affairs. Rarely in its history had the House of Commons voluntarily meddled with problems of colonial government, and the outcome of the American Revolution was tacitly accepted as the final proof that the brief burst of legislative energy between 1765 and 1775 had been altogether ill-advised. Nevertheless, the Tories after 1815 had faced the inevitable implications of the fact that Canada, Newfoundland, and Australasia were already governed under acts of Parliament, and they had not hesitated to bring in bills dealing with those parts of the empire, whenever their legal advisors held that the measures they had in mind needed parliamentary sanction. William Pitt the Younger was quoted to show that he foresaw the need for future amendments to the Constitutional Act of 1791, while the disadvantages under which British settlers in Lower Canada laboured as a minority group had appeared to many Whigs, as well as to Tories, to justify interference from Westminster on their behalf. After the radicals had succeeded in bringing about the withdrawal of the Union Act of 1822, however, even the Tories lost heart and confined their legislation to matters of detail; while the Whigs ultimately adopted the radical position that there must be no legislation in England for Canada, except such as had been requested by the colonists themselves. "We have stopped the Canada Bill,"²⁸ was the proud boast of Joseph Hume in one of his early letters to Mackenzie just before the Whigs came into office, and although the writer of this article is not clear which dragon had been slain, the quotation may stand as a triumphant summing up of the radical position.

From this general principle the Whigs never receded until Lord John Russell introduced his famous resolutions in the summer of 1837. Lord Glenelg, the year before, in pleading with his colleagues to delay punitive action against the Lower Canadians in spite of the majority report of the Gosford Commission, stated his case as follows:

Hitherto the British Legislature has been no parties [*sic*] to the Canadian controversy. The House of Commons had even anxiously abstained from an engagement in it. The Committees of 1828 and of 1834 dissuaded any Parliamentary interference, and advised that the subject should be referred exclusively to the conduct of the Executive Government. This kind of neutrality of Parliament was dictated by much apparent wisdom. It has left open a resource to which resort might be had upon an extreme emergency. It has given to the contest an administrative, rather than a national character. . . . The reverence with which the House of Commons, especially in its reformed char-

²⁸See enclosure in private letter, Colborne to Hay, Sept. 17, 1830, C.O. 42/391.

acter, is even yet regarded in British North America, is a spell not to be broken, except at the bidding of inevitable necessity.²⁹

And Lord Howick, in writing to his brother-in-law after the publication of the Durham *Report*,³⁰ put forward the argument which had been so often voiced in Parliament by Sir James Mackintosh. Although he gave hearty approval to Durham's ideas on the future constitution of Canada, he objected on principle to having it promulgated by Parliament before the colonists themselves had had an opportunity to discuss it. He proposed that a constitutional convention be called, to meet in Montreal, to consider the terms for the union of the two Canadas, and, in order to avoid the obvious difficulties in selecting delegates to represent rebellious subjects, he advised that for certain districts the delegates should be appointed by the Governor-General. Howick was a doctrinaire thinker whose views never changed perceptibly during his active political career, and this extreme reluctance to invoke parliamentary action, even in a great emergency, explains the absence of imperial measures during his term of office on such subjects as the clergy reserves in the Canadas, on which it was clear that the councils and assemblies would never agree.

There was in fact only one act of Parliament dealing with the government of the Canadas during the seven years preceding the Russell resolutions, and that was, in effect, the repeal of earlier legislation. The Howick Act of 1831 turned over the revenues collected under the Quebec Revenue Act of 1774 (14 Geo. III, c. 88) to the legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada for appropriation.³¹ Although the Colonial Office was to insist for the next six years that these revenues must be used, as provided in the earlier act, to pay for the civil government of the two provinces, no such condition was laid down in the act of 1831. When the Assembly of Lower Canada persisted in its refusal to grant salaries for more than a year at a time, and the Council rejected appropriation bills which did not make more permanent provision for the "civil list," the salaries of most officials in Quebec went unpaid for three years, and were ultimately paid in full, as they had previously been paid in part, from the "army extraordinaries." On this one issue Lord Goderich and Lord Howick, as well as all their successors, gave full support to the Council; yet the Whigs were never willing to repeal the

²⁹See Glenelg's minute for the Cabinet, printed in Durham Papers, P.A.C., *Report*, 1923, 222-4.

³⁰See Howick's letter to Durham, *ibid.*, 338.

³¹See P.A.C., *Report*, 1931, 236-7.

Howick Act, as the Tories would unquestionably have done had they remained in office in 1835. Perhaps one can trace here the working out in practice of Howick's theory that the people's representatives will surely yield to reason when the break-down of government discommodes their constituents; and if so, he probably learned from bitter experience to make an exception for the French Canadians in his generalizations about the human race. But his firm conviction that Parliament should not legislate for the colonists, except at the request of the colonists themselves, remained unshaken even by a rebellion.

Although the political philosophy of the Whigs for the government of dependencies may well seem austere and negative, there can be no question of their sincere desire to bring about greater harmony between the colonists and the mother country. Their failure to make any headway in this direction during their first term of office was not due so much to the philosophy itself as to their lack of accurate information about political conditions in each province, and the biased sources from which they received such information as they had. There was always a tendency on the part of Englishmen who had not been to America to assume that the colonies were all alike, and that their political life resembled that of eighteenth-century Virginia, if not that of the mother country itself. Secretaries of state who should certainly have known better took it for granted that there must be country gentlemen in the remoter districts eligible for election to the assemblies, and if the voters were unfortunately too democratically inclined to choose these men of "property and position," they could be added to the legislative councils. Ministers overlooked the fact that such men, if they existed, would in most cases vote with the official majority and add to the legislative deadlock. The Whigs, with even less experience than the Tories of the peculiarities of colonial populations, started with fresh enthusiasm to make colonial institutions more like those of the mother country.

After mature consideration, wrote Lord Goderich in 1831, the ministers were convinced of the propriety of transferring to the Canadas "every institution which the more ample experience of Great Britain recommends as calculated to promote at once the Stability of Government and the Welfare of Society at Large."³² The legislatures were therefore invited to pass laws giving the judges tenure during good behaviour, and providing at the same time

³²P.A.C., *Report*, 1931, 208.

(needless to say) funds by which their salaries would be permanently secured. On English precedent also the judges were excluded from the councils, except for the chief justice who in Lower Canada had always been the presiding officer in the upper house. The first of these reforms, although frequently requested by colonial assemblies in the past, had not been recommended by the Canada committee;³³ the second, which was in accord with the committee's recommendations, was extremely unpopular with colonial governors. The fact that Lords Goderich and Howick were prepared to go ahead with both, in all four colonies, was therefore a tangible proof of their willingness to go beyond the limits set by the Canada Committee, and to disregard the advice of conservative governors in the case of a measure which they could understand and execute themselves. The failure of the legislatures to grant permanent salaries blocked the first of these measures in most colonies; the second was duly put into operation.³⁴

This emphasis on making the colonies more like England may appear odd in view of the widespread conviction, prevalent especially among Whigs and radicals, that the colonies were destined to become independent. But that belief was not really inconsistent with the hope that British North America, whether colonial or independent, would learn to prefer English institutions to American; the importance of keeping them British in sentiment, if not in sovereignty, became more apparent each year with the outpouring of British emigrants and British capital in their direction. The goodwill of the colonists was regarded as exceedingly important by those in England who had any interest at all in the American provinces, worth almost anything except the expenditure of pounds sterling on their government or the sacrifice of valuable trade elsewhere. The removal of colonial preference in the timber trade—a preference on which the whole prosperity of Lower Canada and New Brunswick was founded in the early nineteenth century—was the avowed purpose of the Whig Chancellor of the Exchequer; but Lord Goder-

³³*Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1819-1828*, ed. Arthur G. Doughty and Norah Story (Ottawa, 1935), 470. James Stephen had testified against giving appointments for life in the colonies, and his reasons apparently convinced the committee. P.P. 1828, vol. VII.

³⁴Lower Canada passed a law covering both reforms, but it was disallowed because the Act of 1791 had provided that councillors once appointed could not be removed except by act of the Imperial Parliament. The ministers were able to evade this legal difficulty, however, by directing the judges to absent themselves from meetings of the Council. Unfortunately, the two houses in Lower Canada were never again able to agree on a law giving the judges both tenure and salary.

ich was eloquent in his denial that the ministers were indifferent to the welfare of the colonists or would ever sacrifice their interests "to the advantage of a foreign state."

We are two [sic] well convinced of the importance of those Colonies to the general strength and power of England [he wrote in 1831] not to feel that such a policy, would be in the highest degree mischievous, and we deem the progressive developement of their general resources one of the most interesting objects to which our attention can be directed. But we are obliged at the same time to look to the general interests of the Empire at large, and if it should not be found possible to make local Interests of the particular portion in the scale we cannot but trust that our motives will not be misunderstood or our intentions misrepresented by those whom we are most desirous to conciliate.³⁵

Conciliation, even though hedged with vexing limitations, was, in fact, the order of the day. The problem which became of increasing importance, therefore, as the years passed and the realities of the political situation in different parts of North America became more apparent, was which party in each colony to conciliate.

In the case of Lower Canada it was more or less taken for granted, following the publication of the report of the Canada Committee, that the party opposed to the Dalhousie administration (which was, of course, the pro-French party) must be won over. Of this party, three members, including John Neilson of Quebec, had appeared before the committee and had made a good impression. There could be no question that this party was in complete control of the Assembly, and that only by drastic changes in the Canadian constitution could that hold be broken. The ministerial policy from the day the report was published, therefore, amounted to an attempt to appease the French Canadians, a pursuit which could not fail to antagonize all but a very few of the British settlers in the province, and which also had the unfortunate effect of making the French-Canadian leaders more unreasonable in their demands.³⁶ Although for two years the affairs of Lower Canada did appear to be moving

³⁵P.A.C., *Report*, 1935, 259. The quotation is from a private letter from Goderich to Sir John Colborne. The feeling against the changes proposed in the timber duties was intense everywhere. For the celebration in New Brunswick when the bill was defeated, see W. S. MacNutt, "The Politics of the Timber Trade in Colonial New Brunswick," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXX, March, 1949, 48.

³⁶This policy really started with Murray's despatch in which he directed Kempt to accept Papineau as Speaker of the Assembly. (P.A.C., *Report*, 1930, 147.) There were a number of lapses from it under Lord Goderich, and even more under Stanley, owing, perhaps, to the influence of R. W. Hay, who continued to be very active until 1835. One notable example of the vacillations of the Colonial Office was the case of James Stuart, who was ultimately removed from the office of Attorney-General on the basis of charges preferred by the Assembly at Quebec. It is significant that the British party in Montreal attributed the action of Lord Goderich, which was taken

somewhat more smoothly, the "era of good feeling," such as it was, came abruptly to an end in the spring of 1832 with the "murder" of three French Canadians by British troops in the course of a riotous by-election in Montreal. Neither the British government nor the Governor-General, Lord Aylmer, had any responsibility at all for this unfortunate occurrence, since the troops had been called in, in a perfectly legal manner, by the civil magistrates. Nevertheless, Papineau and his followers were thereafter completely intransigeant, demanding the amendment of the act of 1791, which they had formerly praised to the skies, the application of the "elective principle" to the choice of magistrates as well as of legislative councillors, and (by 1834) a constitutional convention on the American model, to provide them with a new form of government.

Although the Whig ministers were in the course of time aware of the change for the worse in the political situation of the lower province, and although some members of the Cabinet were certainly in favour of stronger measures, such as the repeal of the Howick Act, appeasement continued to be the Whig policy until 1836. Thomas Spring Rice, Colonial Minister for a few months in 1834, went further than any of his predecessors in the attempt to find French candidates for every vacant post in the province, and the choice of Lord Gosford to head the Commissioners in 1835 was almost certainly due to his Irish record, which marked him as one willing to extend the olive branch to chronic opponents of the central Government. It would be no great exaggeration to say that the ministers became more conciliatory as the French leaders became more abusive and more openly republican. The fact that John Neilson and many of the moderate French-Canadian politicians broke with Papineau, and formed a middle group, made no real difference; it was Papineau who controlled the votes, and Papineau's party with whom the Whigs were prepared to deal, if he or any of his followers could be brought to modify their demands and bring them within the range of Whig constitutional ideas. If it had been Papineau, and not Robert Baldwin, who sought cabinet government on the English model in 1836, he would surely have been given a hearing.

Whether or not the Whig policy toward the French Canadians was wise and statesmanlike, it was at least based on a certain amount

after many delays and severe official censure of Lord Aylmer for having suspended Stuart, to the supineness of the Whig ministers in the face of French-Canadian demands. Actually, it was based on a very careful review of Stuart's case by the law officers of the Crown in England. See C.O. 42/239 for the correspondence on the subject between the law officers and Stephen, as well as the report itself. Stanley's policy will be discussed in the second article.

of information about the state of parties in the lower province. Unquestionably the ministers would have preferred to do business with the English party or with the new constitutional association, but, since neither group could win enough seats in the Assembly to influence the votes of that body, it could not be argued that either one had a mandate to represent the people of Lower Canada. In Upper Canada, however, where a policy of conciliation should have worked well, had it been properly directed, there was a most disastrous lack of information about political conditions. The official despatches of Sir John Colborne, like those of his predecessor, Sir Peregrine Maitland, barely referred to elections or party politics, and the friendly and illuminating notes which he addressed (unfortunately for himself) to R. W. Hay were discredited as being partisan in tone. The Legislature of Upper Canada had never had an agent in London,³⁷ and the two most important self-appointed ambassadors at the Colonial Office after 1820 not only represented the two extremes of the political spectrum, but were both of them guided by self-interest and an exaggerated sense of their own importance. In the twenties, Archdeacon Strachan, the strongest and most reactionary member of the famous "family compact," spent the better part of two years in London attempting to advance his own career and to guide Lord Bathurst on decisions with regard to the government of the colony, always, of course, in the interests of his own group.³⁸ In the thirties, William Lyon Mackenzie, the friend and correspondent of Joseph Hume, spent less time in the metropolis, but saw more people, and had what was perhaps an even more disastrous effect on ministerial policy.

Mackenzie's later history, and the rapid collapse of his following in 1837, has blinded even his biographers to the importance of his influence in England before the rebellion. He was accepted not only by the radicals, but also in government circles, as the outstanding representative of colonial opinion, in so far as that opinion was critical of the mother country. Almost a hundred of his letters and articles were published in the London journals and were presumably widely read. He had an enormous advantage over the French leaders

³⁷The Canada Committee recommended that Upper Canada be permitted an agent in London, if it wanted one (see *Constitutional Documents, 1819-28*, 476). The Assembly of Lower Canada succeeded in overcoming the difficulties raised by the Council as to the choice and remuneration of the agent, but the Assembly of Upper Canada would not appear to have made a similar effort.

³⁸P.A.C., *Report*, 1935, 186, 216. See also Andrew Cochran's letter to Lord Dalhousie, previously quoted, for an instance of the kind of pressure Strachan put on Bathurst. *Dalhousie Papers*, vol. 10, Cochran to Dalhousie, March 31, 1825.

and their emissary, Denis Viger, who could neither write nor speak English, in that he was not only articulate, but also a good journalist, and knew how to select his subject-matter to appeal to the public he was addressing. His favourite theme of the selfishness and corruption of the official class in the Canadas probably went down very well with his London readers. In Downing Street he was certainly not popular either with Lord Goderich or the permanent staff, but the fact remains that they took him all too seriously. There are two thick volumes of his memoranda, preserved in the "original correspondence," and his criticisms and recommendations are constantly mentioned in the despatches.

The truth of the matter would seem to be that no one at the Colonial Office remembered anything about the earlier excitements in the province over the case of Robert Gourlay and the dismissal of Judge Willis, and they, therefore, regarded the publisher of the *Colonial Advocate* as the representative of new and dangerous tendencies which deserved the closest study, if they were to be checked before they assumed the menacing aspect of the opposition in Quebec. Lords Goderich and Howick listened carefully to his strictures against Sir John Colborne and his councillors, discussed with him his suggestions for the removal of grievances, and although a despatch was ultimately composed which vindicated Colborne and criticized Mackenzie,³⁹ effect of its publication in York was to throw his opponents into paroxysms of helpless rage by the proof it gave that a Whig Secretary of State had received and listened to such a disreputable member of the colonial population.

In order to understand the warmth of Mackenzie's reception in England and its violent repercussions in York, the events leading up to the visit must be recalled. The conservatives in Upper Canada, through their control of the patronage during the long administration of Sir Peregrine Maitland, had built a political machine which was, at least in part, responsible for their victories in the elections of 1830 and 1836. Mackenzie, who in 1830 was chosen as a member for the County of York, embarked at once on a series of articles in his paper, abusing the body of which he was a member; with the very rapid sequel that he was expelled from his seat, not on the basis of evidence that his election was invalid, but because the Assembly regarded his writings as libellous. In the course of the following year he was re-elected by his constituents, and again expelled, this time being declared ineligible to sit. These proceedings of a reactionary

³⁹Goderich remarked that Mackenzie's style "was singularly ill-adapted to bring such important questions to a definite issue." P.A.C., *Report*, 1935, 310.

assembly presented, obviously, a close parallel to the Wilkes case and were in themselves anathema to any good Whig; but, even worse from the point of view of the Colonial Office, they also resembled the actions of the Assembly in Quebec in the case of Robert Christie, against which many futile protests had been penned in Downing Street. On the margin of the despatch in which the proceedings on the occasion of Mackenzie's second expulsion are described, the word "illegal" is pencilled in a clear, firm hand which is almost certainly that of Lord Howick.⁴⁰ In April 1832, after the news arrived of Mackenzie's second re-election, a confidential despatch was sent to Colborne, directing him to use all the influence he had with individual members of the Assembly to persuade them to vote against expelling the publisher for the third time.⁴¹ Since the law officers of the Crown, H. J. Boulton and C. A. Hagerman, were among the most influential members of the Assembly, pressure from the Governor might well have been expected on this occasion to turn the scales; but not only did those gentlemen disregard his advice; they also refused to admit that there was any resemblance to the case of John Wilkes.

Meantime Mackenzie sailed for England in the summer of 1832 and spent the following winter and spring in London. In his long and discursive epistle asking for an interview with Lord Goderich, he represented himself as acting for more than a dozen groups and associations in Upper Canada, but his most definite assignment was to work for the disallowance of an act of the Assembly increasing the capital stock of the York Bank.⁴² It was a part of his good luck that his views on banking coincided to some extent with those of Poulett Thomson at the Board of Trade, for it gave him yet another wedge with which to work his way into the councils of the Whitehall offices. There can be no question, however, that his importance in the eyes of everyone in London rested chiefly on his connection with that redoubtable M.P., Joseph Hume, with whom his published correspondence had begun in 1830. Lord Goderich had attempted to prepare for broadsides in Parliament on the subject of the administration of Upper Canada by having a careful count made of the signatures on petitions for and against Mackenzie which were flooding his office, since, if it could be stated that there were more against, "a strong argument may be raised with a view to [showing?] our Parl. (Hume, etc., etc.) that Mackenzie is not to be taken as an

⁴⁰C.O. 42/411, Colborne to Goderich, Jan. 31, 1832.

⁴¹P.A.C., *Report*, 1935, 294.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 301-3.

authority."⁴³ But he could not prevent the fiery little publisher from being given a hero's welcome by the radicals and a warm reception by such important members of the Whig inner circle as Poulett Thomson and Edward Ellice.

The climax of Mackenzie's visit came in March, 1833, when he had his two final interviews with Lord Howick, and, while no one is under obligation to accept literally his account of these conversations, there seems no reason to doubt that in general they followed the lines he has indicated. Throughout his stay in London Mackenzie had kept up a continual volley of abuse against Sir John Colborne, H. J. Boulton and C. A. Hagerman (the law officers of the Crown who had led the attack on him), and others, "the business of whose lives was to oppose and render of none effect nearly every measure for increasing the happiness of the people, which had been determined by the Colonial Department." As soon as he was able to gather together his evidence in convincing form, he presented himself at the Colonial Office with the purpose of showing that Boulton and Hagerman, as well as other appointees of the Crown, had not only voted for his third expulsion, but had also indulged in vituperative abuse of the ministers in the debates which followed the reception of Lord Goderich's despatch already mentioned. Boulton and Hagerman, he told Lord Howick, "are the most active men in the province in their opposition to measures to which your lordship and the people are friendly; and they are backed in the executive council by their relatives who form a majority of its members. . . . A governor would stand alone if he were to declare himself of your lordship's opinion." Howick promised (according to Mackenzie) that "just and expedient measures" would be taken, and at the second interview stated that the whole question of the composition of the councils was under consideration of the Government. When Mackenzie began to press upon him again the peculiar wickedness of the two law officers, his Lordship announced dramatically, "They are removed."⁴⁴

It is unnecessary to discuss here how far Mackenzie was really responsible for the removal of Boulton and Hagerman from office. As is well known, Hagerman was immediately restored to his post when Stanley succeeded Lord Goderich, and Boulton was made Chief Justice of Newfoundland; so that what might have been the promising beginning of a "purge" of reactionaries in Upper Canada

⁴³This is another quotation from Goderich's note to Howick, cited above, note 25.

⁴⁴The two interviews were described by Mackenzie in a statement he prepared for his "York Committee," extracts of which appeared in the *Colonial Advocate* of Aug. 29, 1833 (no. 484).

came to nothing. Mackenzie, very naturally, returned to a chronic state of opposition against the Whig ministers as well as against the provincial Government, from which he emerged for no more than a few days to greet Sir Francis Bond Head, "the reformer," in 1835. As a result of his London visit, however, he was firmly established in the minds of everyone in Downing Street as the one important leader of that opposition. When he returned to the province his political career continued to be studied with the utmost care, and the triumph of the opposition party in the election of 1834 was greeted as the proof that all that he had said about his influence and importance was once and for all vindicated. Nothing that Sir John Colborne wrote as to his real unpopularity with the majority of the voters had the slightest effect, and Colborne's recall in 1835 was in no small degree due to the fact that he refused to be sufficiently alarmed by Mackenzie's apparent success.

The whole Mackenzie episode, if it is regarded in the light of the sincere efforts of the Whigs to educate themselves about conditions in the colony, was a disaster. They would have learned much more by a careful study of Colborne's private letters to R. W. Hay, which contain a very fair picture of the state of parties in Upper Canada, and were prophetic in their judgments as to which members of the opposition were worthy of confidence. Mackenzie, Colborne wrote again and again, was a demagogue who was trying unsuccessfully to convert the province to "American" principles, and any attention given him would merely offend the loyal settlers. His influence was confined to the York "Ridings," and he had no followers in the newly settled communities. He, Colborne, had watched the proceedings of the Assembly with great regret, knowing that Mackenzie would make capital out of his martyrdom; but the Assembly, far from being under the thumb of the administration, was inclined to make a display of its independence, and was moved by the widespread unpopularity which Mackenzie had incurred in most districts. "In dealing with the *three* Parties in the province, much circumspection is required. Two of them are firmly attached to us and our Institutions. All attempts to change the principles and views of the persons who are classed in the third party, or ward off their attacks by concession, or undue attention to their proposals . . . and grievances will fail and I think may prove ruinous, in a Colony where we must depend entirely on the attachment of the Parties opposed to their views. . . ."⁴⁵

Although he was inclined to defend Boulton and Hagerman, and

⁴⁵C.O. 42/411, Colborne to R. W. Hay, private, Sept. 21, 1832.

to praise them for their co-operation with the administration in the Assembly on all matters other than the expulsion of Mackenzie, Colborne made some very sensible suggestions of candidates for the vacant post of solicitor-general, among them that of Robert Baldwin. Before his retirement, moreover, he recommended both William and Robert Baldwin for appointment to the Legislative Council. It seems sufficiently clear, therefore, that, had the ministers not been so deeply impressed by Mackenzie's own estimate of himself, and by the fear of what his friends in the House of Commons would do and say, they might have paid more attention to the one group in any colony which really shared their enthusiasm for making the institutions of British North America more like those of the mother country. Certainly they could hope for no constructive suggestions along those lines from Mackenzie or from his backers in Parliament.

There was no Mackenzie in Nova Scotia, nor, until 1836, a Joseph Howe to lead the Assembly in opposition to the local "family compact." It has often been remarked how many Nova Scotians visited England in this period and how much at home they were in Downing Street; but it is important to understand that they all represented the governing class, and that the resentment of other districts of the province against the domination of Halifax, which had burst out in the long wrangle over the merits of the Pictou Academy, had never registered itself in resolutions or reports of grievances. This apparently was because the Council and its supporters in the Assembly were astute enough politically not to interfere with the appropriation of funds for local enterprises, particularly roads and bridges, even though the bulk of those funds was collected in the port of Halifax and the merchants there might complain that a larger share should be spent by the central Government of the province.⁴⁶ It is significant that when an effective opposition did get under way, it started in the city of Halifax as a protest against the tight hold of a few families on the city government.

Lord Goderich's proposals for the reorganization of the Council were not entirely forgotten, however, and the first important debate on the subject took place in the Assembly in the early months of

⁴⁶C.O. 217/152, Maitland to Goderich, Jan. 19, 1831. Maitland encloses a memorandum from S. B. Robie, the former Speaker, in which he complains of the unfairness of having the Assembly control the finances, since the money was all collected in Halifax. "The Revenue is appropriated not as in England by votes of the Commons first proposed by the Executive Government . . . but by votes originally proposed by any member of the House of Assembly without any previous communication with H.M.'s government and thus it happens that two thirds of the Assembly have an interest in adding to the Burthens of the Country because the Constituents of those two thirds pay but little and receive much. . . ."

1834. The negative results were in no way due to lack of eloquence on the part of the gentleman who led the attack and pressed for the acceptance of Lord Goderich's plan. Alexander Stewart made every point that could be made, quite in the vein of Edmund Burke in his reforming days, against the conciliar oligarchy; and a few paragraphs of his speech are worth quoting, for it may well have been studied in Downing Street especially when measures of reform were again under consideration in 1837.

Then, Sir, with regard to the powers which these gentlemen wield—do you not meet them in every department? have they not the control of every branch of our public affairs? Now they are legislators—tomorrow they are arbiters of life and death—or the distributors of patronage. They form a Court of appeal in which the decisions of the gravest Judges of the land may be reviewed and reversed—and then they are suddenly changed to a Court of Marriage and Divorce, so that a man cannot get rid of a bad wife without their interference and consent. On all occasions they surround the Representative of Majesty, who in most cases does, and in many cases is bound to, act by their advice, and one of the Members succeeds him when he is absent.

Stewart pointed out that not only was the Council invested with more functions than should be placed in the hands of any single body, but also that, coming as they did from one part of the province, the councillors were the more likely to abuse their power in the interests of their own group. "I know not if there be anywhere such a combination of power political and pecuniary and legislative, except perhaps the Borough of Cashel in Ireland, where the Mayor of the Corporation was the Grand Papa, his twelve sons and sons-in-law the Aldermen and the twenty-four Common Councilmen, so closely connected that they could not enter into the holy bonds of matrimony with any of the Aldermen's daughters."⁴⁷

Not only were Stewart's facts fully authenticated, and the family connections which united the councillors a matter of common knowledge, but the Council found no real defenders in the debate. Most members who spoke simply expressed their ignorance or their indifference, and the discussion languished. More fatal, perhaps, to the persistence of the ministers in putting the measure through was the fact that the two other speakers in favour of reform were not content to accept the measure as it had been outlined by Lord Goderich, but urged that the upper house should be made elective. This was taking a leaf out of the book of Papineau and his party,

⁴⁷The debate was reported in the *Novascotian*, copies of which were enclosed in one of President Jeffrey's despatches (C.O. 217/156). The passages quoted were printed in the *Novascotian* of Feb. 14, 1834.

and brought down the wrath of the Colonial Minister, Stanley, on the head of the member who had first made the proposal.⁴⁸ Whether this ill-timed suggestion explains why the whole matter was dropped, is not apparent, but whatever the reason it was not until the Assembly in 1837 urged the reform of the Council that Lord Goderich's measure was at last put through.

If Nova Scotia between 1830 and 1836, save for a few bursts of temper over quitrents and customs salaries, really merited its reputation for tranquility and loyalty, New Brunswick had a grievance which was almost universally felt, not only against its governing clique, but also against the Colonial Office itself. This was definitely a legacy from the long Tory régime in Downing Street, however, and could be removed by the Whigs without great difficulty as soon as the goodwill of the New Brunswickers, who did not figure in the English news as much as did the Canadians, seemed important enough to cultivate. The story turns very largely on the fortunes of the Baillie family who were (according to their own testimony) great favourites of Lord Bathurst. Two brothers, Thomas and George, were clerks in the Colonial Office in the early twenties. Thomas decided in 1824 to seek his fortunes overseas, and was appointed Commissioner of Crown Lands and Surveyor-General in New Brunswick, with the personal assurance of the Minister (according to Thomas) that his income should never fall below £1,600.⁴⁹ George Baillie remained in Downing Street and became head of the North American staff of clerks. Although in Canadian affairs important matters were always handled by Wilmot Horton or R. W. Hay, acting for Lord Bathurst, that Minister seems to have been guided by George Baillie on most matters connected with New Brunswick. Presumably the two brothers carried on an active correspondence, so that Thomas Baillie was really the power behind the throne, as far as the affairs of the province were concerned, in Downing Street as well as in Fredericton. In the provincial capital meantime, he expanded his office and his income, made a close alliance with William Odell, the Provincial Secretary, whose daughter he married in 1833, and was high in the councils of the Lieutenant-Governor,

⁴⁸C.O. 218/31, Hay to Colin Campbell, April 12, 1834. It is not altogether clear why C. R. Fairbanks, the Solicitor-General, who was in line for promotion to a judgeship, should have made such a proposal just after Stanley had condemned the plan for Lower Canada. He was told that public officers should not advance doctrines diametrically opposite to the "policy of the Government which they serve."

⁴⁹For further information about Thomas Baillie, see MacNutt, "Politics of the Timber Trade." For Baillie's account of his appointment, see his correspondence with R. W. Hay in 1829, C.O. 188/39, "Public Offices and Miscellaneous."

Sir Archibald Campbell. His extravagant manner of living and of administering his office became one of the legends of the province, although one is at liberty to believe that, like most legends, it was subject to exaggeration as the years rolled by.⁵⁰

Baillie was unquestionably one of the most energetic of all the Crown officials in British North America, and was probably in his own way efficient; but whatever his merits, he certainly used his great power and influence to advance his own interests and those of his favourites, at the expense of others in the province. The result was that, by 1832, the New Brunswick Assembly, which faithfully represented the wishes of the old Loyalist families, as well as of the mercantile families more recently established in the principal ports, was determined to get control not only of the Crown revenues from land and timber, but also of the administration of Baillie's office. A delegation was sent to London in 1833, but, unfortunately for the success of the mission, Stanley had just succeeded Goderich, and was in the midst of completing an agreement with the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Land Company, of which George Baillie seems to have been the executive officer.⁵¹ Stanley expected a considerable income for the British Treasury from his agreement with the new company, and refused to consider turning over the proceeds to local control, although the Assembly, in return, was ready to grant a permanent civil list. The forests of New Brunswick, therefore, continued to be a kind of private domain of the Baillie family until an agreement was finally reached between the Assembly and the mother country four years later.

New Brunswick, except for its forests, which had quite suddenly become such a tempting source of wealth to Englishmen and Americans, as well as to the natives of the Maritimes, was somewhat nearer to the English idea of what a colony ought to be than was any other of the North American provinces. The original settlements along the St. John River were still dominated by the Loyalist families who had staked out their claims in 1784, and although their leaders

⁵⁰Hannay says that Baillie reported an income of £10,000 for his department, but that it was actually much greater. "In fact Mr. Baillie was a wealthier man and made a greater display than the governor himself. No resident of New Brunswick at the present day keeps such a style of living as he was able to indulge in. . . . Mr. Baillie was so fond of style that he even attempted to put the employees of the Crown Land Office into uniform and some of the buttons . . . stamped with the name of the Crown Land Department . . . are extant to the present day." James Hannay, *History of New Brunswick* (Saint John, 1909), II, 34.

⁵¹He moved from Downing Street to 2 Parliament Street at this time, in order to conduct the correspondence for the company. See C.O. 188/53, "Public Offices and Miscellaneous"; Baillie's letter is filed in the section marked "Agents."

were soon to form a "family compact" of their own, they had never in the past attained the wealth or the exclusiveness of the Halifax inner circle. With them the merchants of Saint John and other ports co-operated in the Assembly, and even the Legislative Council contained enough of the older generation of both groups to be acquiescent in the Assembly's policy.⁵² Obstruction came entirely from the Governor and his executive councillors, who had no intention of sharing their present and future incomes, or their influence in White-hall, with the rest of New Brunswick's population. Although it was unquestionably the spectacle of lavish wealth displayed by Baillie and his favoured concessionaires which aroused them to action, the Loyalist families would in any case have been deeply offended by the appointment to the most valuable office in the province of an outsider like Thomas Baillie. For they alone among provincials had not been accustomed to such treatment by the mother country. Every office in New Brunswick had been originally conferred on a Loyalist officer or on an official who had served in one of the thirteen colonies, and the early settlers had seen members of their leading families appointed to places not only in their own province, but also in other parts of the Empire. What they desired, therefore, was really a return to the "good old days," plus their full share in the new-found wealth of the province; and that was what they got from Lord Glenelg in 1837.⁵³

The work of the Whig ministers during their first term of office may be described as exploratory and tentative, as far as the North American colonies were concerned, rather than decisive. It is easy to condemn them as faint-hearted reformers, subject to pressure from the die-hard reactionaries in colonial capitals, and to accept Mackenzie's verdict that the forces of reaction within the walls of the Colonial Office itself were still powerful. But the two-year administration of Goderich and Howick had important repercussions. Perhaps the most immediate effect was a great increase of activity

⁵²In 1839 the delegates from the Nova Scotia Council, who conducted a kind of debate with the delegates of the Nova Scotia Assembly in the presence of the Colonial Minister, Lord Normanby, and the Undersecretary, Labouchère, contrasted the situation in New Brunswick before 1837 with the existing situation in Nova Scotia. "The contest in New Brunswick had been between the executive government on one side and the council and assembly on the other." Two out of three delegations to London had represented both branches of the Legislature, and both had agreed to the terms of the civil list. It would seem that the Legislative Council in New Brunswick really played very little part in the whole controversy. *Journal and Proceedings of His Majesty's Legislative Council of the Province of Nova Scotia, 1839-40*, App. 26, p. 42.

⁵³See W. S. MacNutt, "New Brunswick's Age of Harmony," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXII, June, 1951, 105-25.

on the part of the supporters of the old régime in North America. No one who has studied the pages of the *Patriot* and the *Courier*, published in Upper Canada in these years, can doubt that the conservatives saw in the activities of the Whigs and radicals in England the writing on the wall as far as their own control over the province was concerned. It was the increasing bitterness of party strife in all four provinces after 1832 which rendered the later acts of the drama inevitable, and the existence of a reforming ministry in England was to a large extent responsible for the growing political consciousness that lay behind the party politics. When the Whigs returned to office in 1835 the situation overseas had passed beyond the control of conservative governors and councils, and the need for decisive measures was recognized. Their policy for the two years preceding the rebellions in the Canadas will be the subject of a second article.

THE EARLS OF DURHAM AND THE GREAT NORTHERN COAL FIELD, 1830-1880*

DAVID SPRING

PROFESSOR NEW has dealt admirably with the first Earl of Durham as a statesman,¹ and this essay—as its title indicates—will not concern itself with that subject. Instead it seeks to uncover something of the nature of that local society which lay behind the statesman and provided a great English landed family with its wealth and standing in the national community. It will therefore describe the economy of a landed estate where the chief crop was coal, not corn. And since, as Mr. Kitson Clark has so well put it, “we have all been content to describe far too much of the history of the nineteenth century in terms of the play of a few principal actors posturing before a back-cloth painted with conventional figures,”² it is hoped that this account of the Lambtons and their coal mines will make one of those conventional figures—the English landed gentleman—a trifle less conventional in appearance and act.

II

Coal, as one Victorian put it, “stands not beside but entirely above all other commodities. It is the material source of the energy of the country—the universal aid—the factor in everything we do.”³ However prone Victorians were to wax rhetorical about coal, there was good reason for doing so: consider only the statistics of coal mining in nineteenth-century Britain. Although the existing figures are not reliable for the years before 1850, a reasonable guess has put the production of coal in 1800 at 10,000,000 tons; by 1854 it was 64,000,000 and, by 1869, 107,000,000 tons.⁴ Whereas in 1800 the Great Northern Coal Field of Northumberland and Durham held a massive preponderance over the other coal fields of England and Wales, this “headlong almost devastating expansion”⁵ of coal mining

*The author is especially indebted to Viscount Lambton for his courtesy in making the Lambton MSS accessible. A grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council has also helped make this paper possible.

¹C. New, *Lord Durham* (Oxford, 1929).

²G. Kitson Clark, “The Electorate and the Repeal of the Corn Laws,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (London, 1951), 109.

³W. S. Jevons, *The Coal Question* (London, 1865), viii.

⁴Report of the Commissioners Relating to Coal (1871, XVIII), III, ii.

⁵T. S. Ashton and J. Sykes, *The Coal Industry of the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester, 1929), 13.

reduced that preponderance, as a resolute attack was made on the underground treasure that lay beneath so many counties from Yorkshire to South Wales.

Notwithstanding the development of other fields, the coal mines of Northumberland and Durham still bulked large in the nation's coal industry, accounting in 1854 for more than a quarter of England's coal and nearly a quarter of Britain's.⁶ At bottom it was a happy accident of geography that created this position of strength. Not only had Nature endowed the Northern Coal Field with what was roughly estimated in 1829 as 850 square miles of coal (600 in Durham and 250 in Northumberland),⁷ but she had also provided plentiful and excellent means of transportation. Three navigable rivers—the Tyne, Wear, and Tees—supplemented by railways, easily conveyed the produce of neighbouring collieries (hence the classification of collieries in those of the Tyne, Wear and Tees) to ports like Newcastle and Sunderland, and thence by sea to markets foreign and domestic. A parliamentary investigation found in 1842 that the collieries of Northumberland and Durham supplied not only the adjacent Scottish counties and the North Riding of Yorkshire "but the whole of the eastern and southern coasts of England as far as Cornwall, including the metropolis itself, and the great south-east region into which the sales of the inland coal-districts do not penetrate because of the greater cost of land-carriage and the want of canals."⁸ The highway of the rivers and the sea was plainly broad and far-reaching.

After 1830 the coals of Northumberland and Durham moved along this avenue of the waters in ever growing quantity. The Northern Field shipped from its ports roughly 3,800,000 tons in 1830; fifteen years later it exported about 6,400,000 tons.⁹ In 1829 John Buddle, the leading colliery viewer of the North Country, estimated that the Tyne collieries represented a capital investment of one and a half million pounds, and those of the Wear, six to seven hundred thousand pounds.¹⁰ In 1842 he calculated the total investment in the Northern Coal Field at somewhat more than ten millions.¹¹ This remarkable growth in production and investment was in part the

⁶J. H. Clapham, *An Economic History of Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1926), I, 433-4.

⁷*Report on Coal Trade* (1830, VIII), 77.

⁸*First Report of Children's Employment Commission* (1842, XV), 6 ff.

⁹P. M. Sweezy, *Monopoly and Competition in the English Coal Trade 1550-1850* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), 46.

¹⁰*Report on Coal Trade* (1830, VIII), 52.

¹¹Buddle Atkinson MSS, in the possession of the North of England Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineers, vol. 5, *passim*.

result of the opening of the Tees collieries which had barely begun to ship their coals in 1830. But elsewhere, on the Wear perhaps more than on the Tyne, the signs of unprecedented activity were also clear enough: the building of the railways, the rise of Lord Londonderry's port of Seaham, and the risking of great sums of money. The thirties and forties therefore saw the region of the developed coal field extend in every direction, stretching from the Coquet in the north to Middleham in the extreme south, and from Cockfield Fell in the west to the German Ocean in the east.¹²

So numerous and far-flung were the coal workings, that nineteenth-century maps, showing the situation of the colliery pits in the north, give that district the look of a great sieve. Riddled with openings, the face of the country showed no less markedly the stark outlines of engine house and coal heap, the myriad network of tramways and railroads leading coals to the staiths and keels of the rivers, and the grey dwellings of the miners drawn up in bleak, monotonous rows. No wonder that *The Times* in a leading article in October, 1850 described County Durham "as very little more than one huge colliery," and came to the conclusion that "the cities, the villages, the nobility, the clergy, the tradesmen, the labourers, and, we must add the farmers in the county of Durham, all derive their wealth or their competence from Coal."¹³

Of these classes in the society of the North Country, the landed gentry and nobility occupied a distinctive place in the economy of coal. Like the landed aristocracy generally, they benefited from that happy ruling of the Elizabethan courts which gave them the ownership of those minerals, excepting gold and silver, lying below the surface of their lands. In addition the landed gentlemen of Durham and Northumberland in the 1830's and 1840's probably took a larger share in the working of their minerals than did the members of their class situated elsewhere in the coal fields of England, who perhaps more frequently leased their coal to mining adventurers in return for a royalty. This state of affairs may have been in the mind of that investigator for the Midland Mining Commission of 1843 who remarked that, "if we inquire into the general character for wealth and rank of the employers of mining labour in the Tyne and Wear we shall find them to be the nobility and gentry and landed proprietors."¹⁴

¹²From the Newcastle *Advertiser* for 1843 in *Report of Commissioners Relating to Coal*, III, 37.

¹³*The Times*, Oct. 5, 1850, quoted in W. Fordyce, *A History of Coal, Coke, Coal Fields* (London, 1860), 55.

¹⁴*First Report of Midland Mining Commission* (1843, XIII), civ.

According to this sociologically minded observer, the mining entrepreneurs of the north fell into several groups. In the first he put what he called "the great partnership and grandes of the trade": Hetton Colliery, Lord Ravensworth and partners, Lord Londonderry, and the Earl of Durham. Each of these, he claimed, had invested about £500,000 in their mining enterprise, and operated from six to ten or twelve collieries several miles apart. The "second-rank collieries," as the description went, came next: Lord Howden and partners, Colonel Bradyll and partners, each with "perhaps" £200,000 invested. And in the third group, without giving examples, he put the smaller men, employing a capital of £40,000-£60,000; while in the last and most numerous group, again anonymous, those who possessed even smaller resources were placed.¹⁵ It is not clear that landed gentlemen numerically dominated each of these groups, but they probably contributed a major portion of the investment in mining enterprise in the Northern Coal Field.

Whatever the numbers of landed gentlemen working coal, their preponderance in the mining community of the north was plain enough. Combinations among producers in the Northern Coal Field, to take advantage of "the co-existence of a single source of supply in the North with a concentrated market in the South,"¹⁶ had been long known on Tyneside and they had been and were still usually led by the landed families dealing in coal. The Grand Allies, the ancestors of Lord Ravensworth and partners, provided an early example. In 1726 Sidney and Edward Wortley, Thomas Ord, Sir Henry Liddell and George Liddell, George Bowes, and William Cotesworth became partners for 99 years in the working of certain collieries on the Tyne. The terms of the partnership reveal a clear intention to obstruct competitors; and what is known of the operations of the Grand Allies in the first half of the eighteenth century discloses a highly successful attempt at controlling the output of the Tyne collieries.¹⁷

At a later time, when combinations to regulate output and price appeared among the collieries on the Wear, landed gentlemen also took the lead. In 1828, for example, the sale or "vend" of coal from the Wear was parcelled out among the seven chief producers; each agreed not to sell in excess of a fixed quantity of coals. The largest amounts allocated were those assigned to Lords Londonderry and Durham, together outweighing all the rest. This "regulation of the

¹⁵*Ibid.*, cv.

¹⁶Ashton and Sykes, *Coal Industry*, 211.

¹⁷Sweezy, *Monopoly and Competition in the English Coal Trade*, 24-9; Private Acts, 13 & 14 Vict., c. 18.

vend" in 1828 was a general one: that is, it applied to both rivers, and a joint committee, representing the chief collieries of the Tyne and Wear, had worked out the contribution of each mining operator to the total vend. In 1829, however, the regulation broke down, temporarily, largely because the grandees of the trade could not see eye to eye.¹⁸ They could, it seemed, at this time, make or break combinations in the Great Northern Coal Field.

Lord Durham was chiefly responsible for the break-down of 1829. This impulsive, moody aristocrat, son-in-law of Earl Grey and a Radical in politics, was the owner of an estate of about 17,000 acres in size, in the northeast corner of County Durham. The centre of the estate, Lambton Castle, stood on the north bank of the Wear, seven miles south of Newcastle, in a park of 1200 acres. The castle, recently rebuilt, was a formidable sham Gothic pile, ornamented and turreted. From its battlements one looked down upon the Wear flowing through thickly wooded, overhanging banks, and out over the park where in the early 1820's horse racing each October brought sportsmen from all over England.¹⁹ This might easily have been Trollope's Barsetshire.

But beyond the park, although out of sight from the castle, there were many things that Trollope—or even Surtees, a native of Durham—never saw fit to associate with the ways of landed gentlemen. For the Lambton estate was primarily a mining property: its thousands of acres were prized chiefly for what lay beneath the soil, and the Earls of Durham might well have echoed the Earl of Crawford who enjoined his grandson: "Colliers we are and colliers we must ever remain."²⁰ Accordingly the Lambton mines, however much planted out and screened from view, burrowed so close to the castle that fissures and cracks appeared in the walls.²¹ The numerous coal pits, moreover, were linked by a network of private railway that found its centre in Philadelphia, a place of machine shops and sombre miners' cottages, and its terminus in Sunderland, whence the Lambton coals found their way by sea to the great London market. This was a small mining empire, a thing of wonder to show

¹⁸Sweezy, *Monopoly and Competition in the English Coal Trade*, 85-90; *Report on Coal Trade* (1830, VIII), 57.

¹⁹This description of Lambton Castle and Park is derived from E. Mackenzie and M. Ross, *An Historical, Topographical and Descriptive View of the County Palatine of Durham* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1834), I, 137; Lord Broughton, *Recollections of a Long Life* (London, 1910), III, 28.

²⁰The Earl of Crawford, "Haigh Cannel," *Presidential Address to the Manchester Statistical Society* (London, 1933).

²¹Lambton MSS, in the possession of Viscount Lambton, Biddick Hall, Co. Durham, Diary of second Earl of Durham, June 15, 1854.

to visiting foreigners such as the Russian aristocrat whom Lord Durham's agent took around the estate in 1836.²² Perhaps he marvelled at these unusual trappings of aristocracy.

In 1835 John Buddle was hired to look over the Lambton collieries and report on their condition. He found their management "conducted in all its details both above and below ground with judgment and economy"; for the first six months of the year there was a profit showing of £24,000. He valued the collieries at £540,000, the working mines being worth slightly more than two-thirds of this amount, and the working stock, including the railway, less than one-third.²³ This figure was of momentary interest to Lord Durham and his chief agent, Henry Morton; for with the rush of new capital and enterprise into the Northern Coal Field at this time, there was some thought of the Lambtons selling out at a good price. But it was not long seriously entertained. As Morton saw it, the prospective purchaser, the Stanhope Colliery Co., might well fail to find so large a sum of money and they would all end up in the Court of Chancery, that "refuge and . . . asylum for every villain."²⁴

The Lambton collieries, both working and dormant, according to Buddle's report, were ten in number: six working collieries, Newbottle, Cocken, Harraton, Lumley, Little Town, and Sherburn; and four dormant, Shadforth, Ludworth, Sherburn House, and Cassop. Some of these belonged outright to the Earl of Durham but a number were leased, either in part or entirely, from one or several landlords, sometimes from a lessee. Newbottle, for example, was held of three persons: 2300 acres from Mr. Fawcett, the immediate lessee under the Bishop of Durham; 150 acres from the Rector of Houghton; and 425 from the Marquis of Londonderry. Again, Lumley colliery was leased from the Earl of Scarborough; Cocken was leased in part from T. S. Carr, Esquire, in part from the Bishop of Durham, and the rest was Lambton property recently purchased from the Dean and Chapter of Durham.²⁵

These were working collieries. But the dormant, if less of a patch-work, were also leased as well as owned by the Earl of Durham. The dormant colliery was in no small degree the result of a strong desire to stifle competition especially at a time, such as the 1830's, when the flood of newcomers into the Northern Coal Field was a source of discomfiture to the established mine operators. Henry Morton was

²²*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, Aug. 21, 1836.

²³Buddle Atkinson MSS, "Report upon the Earl of Durham's Collieries."

²⁴Lambton MSS, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, June 5, 1836.

²⁵Buddle Atkinson MSS.

constantly urging his master to take steps, either by himself or in conjunction with others, to keep out or inhibit unwelcome adventurers. This policy could take the form of purchasing an operating colliery—North Hetton—in alliance with Lord Londonderry and the Hetton Colliery Co., so that the “three great collieries” stole a march on that alarming product of joint-stock finance, the Durham Colliery Co.²⁶ And the strategy of exclusion could equally well take the shape of buying or leasing acres of coal as yet unworked; hence the dormant collieries of the Earl of Durham, some of which the Earl purchased from the Bishop of Durham, some of which he leased.

The Bishop of Durham, the Dean and Chapter of Durham: these clerical dignitaries appear frequently in the story of coal-mining in the north, and with good reason. For the Church, in the shape of these two quite distinct bodies—the Bishop, and the Dean and Chapter—was probably the largest owner of coal in the north, certainly in Durham. Although the occasional Anglican parson may have opened a colliery on his glebe, the extensive property of the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter was leased to others for exploitation; and this clerical coal, subject to leases peculiar to Church property, stood on its own distinctive footing: so much so that it gained the reputation of being “a difficult species of property to understand,” according to one witness at the parliamentary inquiry into Church leases.²⁷ The conventional lease of coal in the North Country during the 1830’s and after took the form of a “certain rent,” that is, a fixed sum paid whether the minerals were worked or not, and a royalty or “tentale rent,” as it was called in the north, to be paid for each “ten” of coal mined in excess of the minimum covered by the “certain rent.”²⁸

The Church dealt otherwise with its property. The Bishop, for example, leased his coal in the 1830’s on a system of lives: a lease for three lives renewable at the dropping of any one life; while the Dean and Chapter dealt in leases usually of twenty-one years renewable at the end of every seven. In such leases, moreover, both of the Bishop and of the Dean and Chapter, a rent—usually nominal—was reserved, and a fine, from which the lessor’s revenue in fact came, was payable at each time of renewal.²⁹ This system had its critics: lessees complained that leases of lives were uncertain, and leases for years renewable every seven years too short; on the other hand they were

²⁶Lambton MSS, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, July 10, 1838.

²⁷*Report from the Select Committee on Church Leases* (1838, IX), 95.

²⁸*Report on Coal Trade* (1830, VIII), 37-8.

²⁹*First Report from the Episcopal and Capitular Revenues Commissioners* (1850, XX), 1.

well content with what they paid into clerical coffers, for the Church did not press them hard.³⁰

Indeed, during the 1830's when the Established Church was being carefully scrutinized in every nook and cranny and vague frightening rumours of drastic change in the management of Church property spread through the north, the lessees of clerical coal showed much anxiety. They feared that the government would somehow put an end to the renewal of leases, letting them run out; and good Whigs though some of them were, this seemed to be taking enthusiasm for reform a bit too far. The Lambtons had held dormant extensive areas of Church coal for many years, automatically paying the periodic fine, but making no profit from the mines.³¹ This leasehold property, moreover, in the course of years if not centuries, had become the subject of mortgage and family settlement.³² To change the lessees by refusing to renew leases would, as Henry Morton gloomily announced, "make a compleat revolution of property in the County of Durham."³³

The Lambton agents were quick to scotch these rumours of catastrophe. In the absence of the Earl, who was serving as ambassador to the Russian court, they acted promptly and effectively. The Earl's legal adviser wrote to Lord Melbourne objecting to the injustice of altering arrangements with the Church. Henry Morton advised Mr. Lambton, the Earl's brother, to speak in the same vein to Lord John Russell. And finally Morton himself went up to London to consult the Earl's father-in-law on this grave subject, and returned with the comforting assurance that nothing would be done to disturb the lessees.³⁴ And nothing was done beyond making the management of Church property more efficient and consigning to a gradual extinction the Bishop's leases for lives and the method of raising revenue by fine. Henry Morton was thus saved from contemplating a revolution in the property of County Durham.

III

To talk much about the Lambtons and their coal mines in the nineteenth century is inevitably to talk about Henry Morton, the chief agent or "land steward" of the Earls of Durham from the 1820's until

³⁰Report on Church Leases (1838, IX), 236; Report from the Select Committee on Church Leases (1839, XIII), xiv; First Report from the Episcopal and Capitular Revenues Commissioners, 2.

³¹First Report from the Episcopal and Capitular Revenues Commissioners, 168.

³²Lambton MSS, H. Stephenson to Lord Durham, Feb. 7, 1837.

³³Ibid., Henry Morton to Lord Durham, April 20, 1836.

³⁴Ibid., Henry Morton to Lord Durham, July 24, 1837.

his death in 1870. Morton was typical of those numerous and trusted servants upon whom the English landed gentry relied to a large extent for the efficient conduct of their estates. The novelists have had more to say about estate agents than have the historians and, with such conspicuous exceptions as George Eliot whose father, Robert Evans, was an agent of considerable standing in the Midlands, they have too often given the stewards of landed gentlemen the role of fraudulent despilers of the aristocracy. Caleb Garth in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*, doubtless modelled on her father, came closer to the truth about nineteenth-century land agents than did the figures who appear in the pages of Surtees, for example, who were invariably rogues, busily filling their pockets at the expense of tenant and landlord.³⁵ Caleb Garth was honourable and self-effacing, proud of a calling that was nothing if not versatile, and seemingly never more content than when he was sure he was using the land of England well.

Robert Evans, according to his daughter, came of a humble family: his father was a builder and carpenter and the son, brought up in these trades, eventually turned to farming. His formal schooling was relatively meagre, but he came in the course of time to have "a large knowledge of building, of mines, of plantations, of various branches of valuation and measurement—of all that is essential to the management of large estates."³⁶ His own son was somewhat better educated than himself, but not in those gentlemanly halls of learning—the public schools and the older universities—and the son like the father took up the profession of estate agent. The career of Robert Evans had its counterpart on many estates throughout the English countryside: modest origins; a social standing that made them "gentlemen of the second class," as Surtees once called them;³⁷ a wide knowledge casually acquired; and the raising of a dynasty of agents to parallel the dynasties of landed gentlemen. Henry Morton's career was not unlike this.

Morton came of a fairly prosperous family, the son of a Northumberland farmer "in considerable circumstances" who possibly aspired to better things for his son and sent him to the High School in Edinburgh where his schoolfellows included Jeffrey and Brougham. Morton was a strapping young man, not much in love with books and schooling, and he soon went back to the land where he set up farming for himself near Belford in Northumberland. This was the country

³⁵ Surtees' *Hillingdon Hall* is typical; see also A. Steel, *Jorrocks's England* (London, 1932).

³⁶ J. W. Cross, ed., *George Eliot's Life* (New York, n.d.), I, 5.

³⁷ Surtees' *Ask Mama*.

of Grey of Dilston,³⁸ where the business of agriculture had standards not a whit inferior to those of Coke of Norfolk; a country that produced a sturdy race of farmers and estate agents who spread the gospel of agricultural improvement to every corner of rural England. Here Morton made a name for himself as a sheep farmer, and in this capacity came to the notice of the Lambtons. In 1822 he began work as their agent, apparently at the start responsible only for the agricultural side of estate business. He first laid out a large tract of land for sheep farming, but before the decade was ended he had also taken over the extensive mineral business on the Lambton property.³⁹

Like Grey of Dilston who, in the early 1830's, became the agent for the Greenwich Hospital estates in the North Country, estates that dealt as much in mining (lead) as in agriculture, Morton was probably unfamiliar in the beginning with the getting of minerals. But to master the subject seemed to be no insuperable task for a generation less impressed than is ours—perhaps justifiably—by the rigours of specialized knowledge; and what came from the land or stood upon it—be it corn or sheep, coal or buildings—proved equally matter for the serious concern of agents on estates with a variety of resources. Neither Grey of Dilston nor Henry Morton ever acquired the expert knowledge of a viewer like John Buddle. If a special need appeared, Buddle, or some other mining engineer, could be hired for the occasion; but ordinarily Morton and Grey knew enough to protect the interest of their masters, enough indeed to put the entire administration of their estates on a new footing—reducing extravagance, weeding out the inefficient and corrupt, and bringing their extensive concerns under a unified direction.

In all this Morton served as the eyes of his master, the Earl of Durham. His was the mind that had to encompass the manifold detail of estate business, decide all manner of things from agreements with farming tenants to the purchase of equipment for the collieries and railway. Many were the tours across the Lambton properties that Morton made on horseback, starting at an early hour in the morning and lasting throughout a long day. It was plainly an arduous life, involving as Morton once said, "a great number of Slavish and painful duties."⁴⁰ But someone had to do it, and it was fortunate for England's landed gentlemen whose business, both

³⁸For Grey of Dilston and his work, see his daughter's biography, J. E. Butler, *Memoir of John Grey of Dilston* (Edinburgh, 1889).

³⁹The biography of Henry Morton was drawn largely from T. Fordyce, *Local Records or Historical Register of Remarkable Events* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1867), II, 84–6.

⁴⁰Lambton MSS, Henry Morton to W. H. Lambton, Jan. 24, 1837.

serious and frivolous, often lay elsewhere than on their estates, that the Mortons of nineteenth-century England were fairly plentiful. As Baron Stockmar once advised Victoria's Albert, when that business-like Prince showed too much enthusiasm for administering the Crown estates, he need master only general principles, not a mass of exhausting detail.⁴¹ The Mortons made this possible, allowing their masters to serve the nation—as statesman and diplomat, as did the Earl of Durham—and thus to carry out those duties that landed gentlemen had long taken upon themselves.

Even the first Earl of Durham, active as he was in public life, could keep himself informed about the general condition of his estates. If he was away from Lambton Castle, out of England, he had Morton report to him regularly: for example, when his master was serving as Ambassador to St. Petersburg, Morton wrote long, weekly accounts to him, despatching them in the letter bags of the Foreign Office. In addition the Earl made use of a practice not uncommon on the great estates: he employed a London barrister, Henry Stephenson, to audit his accounts, look into the several departments of estate business, and thus act as a check on Morton and Morton's inferiors.⁴² If there was fraud or inefficiency, this might uncover it, although in the case of Henry Morton it is unlikely that glaring misdemeanours ever came into view.⁴³ For, like many estate agents, he identified himself with the honour and greatness of the family he served, and sometimes, indeed, seemed more devoted to these ideals than the Lambtons themselves. If ever the Earls of Durham needed a conscience they could find it in Henry Morton.

To maintain the Lambtons in their high station in Durham and the national community, Morton had of course to keep the economy of the estate in a flourishing condition, especially the collieries whence the bulk of the family's revenues came, even in the 1830's. He had also to keep intact the Lambton's influence or "interest" in the local elections to Parliament. Landed families were still concerned in the nineteenth century to keep alive their territorial influence: to put into Parliament, if not son or brother, at least a candidate with agreeable political views,⁴⁴ and it was often the task of the agent,

⁴¹T. Martin, *The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort* (New York, 1875), I, 85.

⁴²Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *Life of William, Lord Shelburne* (London, 1875), II, 345-6.

⁴³There was no guarantee, of course, against the auditor proving fraudulent, unless the landlord made sure of his man. Lord Palmerston once advised Lord Shaftesbury to protect himself by getting a reliable auditor; see E. Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury* (London, 1886), III, 147.

⁴⁴G. Kitson Clark, "The Electorate and the Repeal of the Corn Laws."

among other persons, to rally the tenants and conduct a canvass. Henry Morton thus busied himself with county and borough elections: in the Northern District of Durham and in the town of Sunderland. If Lord Londonderry—a Tory and a neighbour of the Lambtons—is to be believed, the political interest of Morton's master, at least in the 1830's, was substantial and firm.⁴⁵

Electioneering thus buttressed the family's position, and so, to a greater degree, did coal. Inevitably the collieries and the coal trade engrossed Morton's attention: how best to save his master from severe competition in the Northern Coal Field; in what ways the output and sale of the Lambton coals could be increased; these problems were always with him. His advice to the Earl concerning the exclusion of the Durham Coal Co. from the coal trade of the north has already been noted. His opposition to the South Durham Railway in the 1830's was similarly determined. Morton was no Colonel Sibthorpe: he saw no harm in railroads *per se*, and thought well of a line that would allow the Earl "to Breakfast at Lambton Castle and dine at Cleveland Row" in the same day.⁴⁶ But the projected South Durham Railway was another matter. Its building would open out "20,000 acres of Coal," bring mischievous spectators onto the scene, and thereby make it difficult for the "best collieries" to regulate output and price. There was but one thing for it: to get up "a strong opposition" to the parliamentary bill for the South Durham; and in this Morton was altogether successful.⁴⁷

He sought equally to keep up the sale of Lambton coals. The threat of a strike among the men must be guarded against by a sufficient stock of coal on hand: "two months' vend," he wrote to the Earl in 1836, "will make you perfectly independent. . . . there is no money among the men, and they can't stand a siege of two months."⁴⁸ Some years later, in 1851, when there was a falling off in the coal trade, and the London market was no longer dominated by the Northern Coal Field, it was Morton who proposed the introduction of screw-propelled iron vessels for the carriage of coals from Sunderland to London: "If coals could be carried at 5s. [shillings] per ton, I should not fear competition from the Great Northern Railway."⁴⁹ Morton's resourcefulness was sometimes extraordinary: in 1836 when the Lambton Wallsend coal was not doing well in the London

⁴⁵R. Weigall, ed., *Correspondence of Lord Burghersh* (London, 1912), 271, Lord Londonderry to Lord Burghersh, Oct. 8, 1832.

⁴⁶Lambton MSS, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, March 27, 1836.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, April 20, 1836; July 17, 1836.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, Aug. 28, 1836.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to second Earl of Durham, Sept. 25, 1851.

market, Morton wrote to the Earl, then in Russia, recommending that Wallsend be introduced into the houses of the Russian nobility. It was, he said, already quite popular with Lord Grey and the English Court.⁵⁰

IV

This unflagging effort—guided in detail from day to day by Henry Morton—to draw substantial and growing revenues from the Earl of Durham's collieries, was a matter of far more consequence to the Lambton family than mere appearance would suggest. This was a time when, possibly to an unprecedented extent, new classes were challenging the ascendancy of the older, aristocratic families; when there was danger of being roughly jostled, if not displaced, by men whose giant wealth could rightfully claim the high places in English society, as wealth had always done. And what was even more disturbing, the older landed families at this juncture often found themselves in financial straits. Aristocracies are perhaps given, more than the middle classes, to being extravagant and without ready cash, and England's was not a little familiar with this frailty. Our "mortgaged aristocracy" Disraeli called them.⁵¹ Their "declension . . . in wealth is irremediable" wrote the *Edinburgh Reviewer*,⁵² and General Dyott, that worthy Staffordshire squire, direfully predicted that "from the extravagance of the aristocracy and the money-making of the merchant, the property in the soil will in a few years change masters."⁵³

These were by no means unfounded opinions. Heavy indebtedness was in fact rife among those landed families untouched by new blood and new wealth. The upper ranks of society during the Regency and the reign of George IV had been conspicuous for their love of the lavish, their preference for expensive vices: one man squandered his fortune in gambling and mistresses; another spent recklessly on elaborate building; a third poured out his money on a contested election for Parliament; and some men did all these things and more. The first Earl finished building Lambton castle which his father had begun. He undoubtedly had a taste for social display, and more than once paid through the nose for a victory at the polls. And finally, as fruitful as any of these sources of debt, there were the burdensome charges arising from the practice of strict family settlement to which the Earl fell heir as the eldest son of an English

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, April 24, 1836.

⁵¹Disraeli, *Sybil*.

⁵²*Edinburgh Review*, "The House of Lords," Oct., 1834.

⁵³R. W. Jeffery, ed., *Dyott's Diary* (London, 1907), II, 58.

landed family. He could not escape these family charges any more than his own son would be able to escape them in the future.⁵⁴

When the first Earl died in 1841, he left debts that amounted to £635,000; of this sum at least £127,000 consisted of family payments. How much of this indebtedness was relatively sound, the result of investment in the Lambton collieries, is not clear. It may be that he financed his collieries entirely out of current revenue; but it is more likely that the Earl resorted instead to mortgages on the unsettled estate, to bonds and promissory notes. Close to £400,000 was borrowed on mortgage, from neighbours such as Sir John Swinburn (£30,000), and from the insurance companies who supplied the Earl with large sums: in the case of the London Life Assurance, £115,000.⁵⁵ The insurance companies were at this time laying out more and more of their great accumulations of savings on long-term mortgages on land. This happy turn in the investment habits of the English insurance companies allowed landed gentlemen to find a source of capital probably hitherto less familiar to them.

But £635,000 of debt was a vast incubus and good reason for anxiety: merely the annual payment of interest made deep inroads on the Lambtons' disposable income, and both the Earl and Henry Morton were therefore intent on reducing the encumbrances as speedily as they could. The only way of doing this was to increase the colliery profits and elsewhere tread lightly in expenditure. The Earl assured his friend T. S. Duncombe in 1834, when Duncombe announced that he was putting his own financial affairs in order, "that any personal sacrifice will be amply repaid by that peace of mind which is ever destroyed by pecuniary embarrassments";⁵⁶ three years later Lord Durham was trying to sell his yacht in an effort to economize.⁵⁷ But if the Earl was converted to retrenchment, the coal trade had had its usual ups and downs: not until 1834 did colliery profits in the Lambton mines show a considerable increase: in that year they were £31,438, in 1835 £49,926.⁵⁸ The Earl moreover died

⁵⁴H. J. Habakkuk, "Marriage Settlements in the Eighteenth Century," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (London, 1950); D. Spring, "The English Landed Estate in the Age of Coal and Iron: 1830-1880," *Journal of Economic History*, winter, 1951.

⁵⁵Lambton MSS, *passim*. These mortgages might have been on the settled estate if the Lambtons' family settlement provided for a special power of mortgaging, or if the Earl had at some time been able to exercise the powers of an absolute owner. Unfortunately it has been impossible to discover the relevant marriage settlement.

⁵⁶T. H. Duncombe, ed., *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Slingsby Duncombe* (London, 1868), I, 354.

⁵⁷Lambton MSS, Henry Morton to Lord Durham, May 14, 1837.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, *passim*.

a few years later, not living long enough to recoup the earlier losses in the collieries and leaving the mountain of encumbrances scarcely touched.

The years 1841 to 1849 constituted the minority of the second Earl. Such times in the history of a landed estate were often prosperous, the tenant for life being in no position to do much harm. Disraeli's *Young Duke*, the Duke of St. James, benefited from "the accumulations occasioned by the unhappy death of his father." And so too did the second Earl of Durham, although hardly in so spectacular a manner as the Duke of St. James. The encumbrances were reduced by £79,000, and had the collieries been more profitable, no doubt the scaling down of the debt would have gone further. Unfortunately the colliery profits fell off sharply during the years of minority: in 1843 they slipped below the returns of 1834, and in 1847 they were as little as £11,695.⁵⁹ The trustees did well to reduce encumbrances at all; and the young Earl came into possession when a pall of gloom hung over his affairs. But what troubled his trustees as much as the decline in coal was the young man himself.

Like Disraeli's Duke before he reformed, the young Earl turned out to be stubborn, reckless, his head full of anything but pounds, shillings, and pence. In 1849, when the Earl came into his own, Lord Grey, one of the first Earl's executors, thoroughly distressed, wrote to his young kinsman in the hope of impressing him with the gravity of the circumstances and so set him off on the right foot. Only the year before, the great Duke of Buckingham's property had come under the auctioneer's hammer, and this astonishing and frightening spectacle had sent a thrill of apprehension through the ranks of England's landed gentlemen.⁶⁰ The Duke of Buckingham was not the first of his class to meet this fate, although few possibly had fallen from so great a height; nor was it likely he would be the last. With this background of catastrophe Lord Grey set out to explain how the behaviour of the young Earl was full of peril for the Lambtons.

You will see that you are entirely dependent on the profits of the colliery for your income—and in the present state of the coal trade you see how small these profits are—whether this state of depression is to continue, or whether we are again to see good times is quite a matter of opinion. . . . Under any circumstances you will see the absolute necessity of the greatest prudence on your part for many years, if you would avoid a ruin as absolute as that which has fallen upon the Duke of Buckingham, and which I believe to be impending over many others. And prudence is the more necessary on your part, that the

⁵⁹*Ibid.*

⁶⁰*Economist*, Aug. 19, 1848; Marchioness of Londonderry, ed., *Letters of Benjamin Disraeli to Frances Anne Marchioness of Londonderry 1837-1861* (London, 1938), 37.

greater part of your income depending upon a very fluctuating trade, in which credit is above all things necessary—anything which might tend to diminish that credit might bring ruin upon you at any moment. For instance the bond debts and promissory notes amount to near £ 100,000 and may be called for at very short notice—and if the holders of these bonds and notes were to take any panic—to think that their money was not safe—say from the belief that you were on the Turf, as from any other cause, they assuredly would call for them and if they did I can see no possible means of averting an immediate bankruptcy.

I have mentioned the Turf—because I was sorry to hear in London that you had again been dabbling in the ring, tho' I was told at the same time that you had won. And I must give you this last warning on the subject—I can only repeat that the *only* safe way for you is not to bet at all—no man can say, so far will I go and no further—But having said this so often—Having placed before you the plain state of your affairs to show how impossible it is for you to indulge in such pursuits without the risk of inevitable ruin—I shall say no more on the subject.⁶¹

This eloquent letter may have gone unread, the Earl having the reputation at this time of being a reluctant reader of letters. At any rate, Grey's warning seems to have done little good immediately. For old Henry Morton in the early 1850's was still scolding the Earl, and with a bluntness that only his years and long service in the Lambton family could excuse. "I sincerely hope," Morton wrote to his master, "you will in future reside more upon your own property, and take an active part in the management of your concerns."⁶² If something came up in the county—a meeting of coal owners or a vacancy for the Lord Lieutenancy of Durham—the agent was quick to bring them to the Earl's notice, presumably in the hope that the son would be stirred into following in the footsteps of a father who had had a busy and useful life. If the Earl's diaries are sufficient evidence, Morton's advice fell on deaf ears: for the time being the Earl remained one of that race of *Corinthians* that never quite died out even in the heyday of Victorian respectability.

But then he reformed, as *Corinthians* often did—as Disraeli's young Duke did. He married in 1854 and there was an end of reprimands and lectures. Never the equal of his father, the second Earl settled down to the responsibilities of a growing family: by 1858 he was putting his mind to business; he was even reading Mill's *System of Logic*; plainly a reformed character.⁶³ At the same time the Lambton collieries came to life again; 1856 proved an *annus mirabilis*, with a profit of £84,207; according to Morton "the most profit-

⁶¹Lambton MSS, Lord Grey to second Earl of Durham, July 9, 1849.

⁶²*Ibid.*, Henry Morton to second Earl of Durham, Oct. 16, 1851.

⁶³*Ibid.*, Diary of second Earl of Durham, July 27, 1858.

able year ever known." Between 1856 and 1880, although the coal trade lived up to its reputation for violently fluctuating returns, 1873 showing a profit of £380,000 for the Lambton collieries and 1876 a loss of £65,000, there was a clear gain recorded in the estate's accounts. For the encumbrances went down: by 1880 they amounted to little more than £100,000, the fat returns of the early 1870's doing much to bring about this happy result.⁶⁴

V

The faith of both the first Earl and Henry Morton in the collieries was thus justified in the course of time. But it proved a fairly long time, and there had been some close scrapes. For years the family fortunes hung on the success of the collieries, imperilled accordingly by all manner of seemingly unrelated things: a Whig government reforming church leases; a strike of pit men; a projected railroad that would open up a new field of coal; even the young heir going on the Turf. Fortunately, although by no means inevitably, each of these came to nothing. The Lambtons found in a servant like Henry Morton unmeasured loyalty and strength; and they themselves, even though the second Earl lacked the stature of his father, lived up to the traditions of their class in the nineteenth century, and the efforts of the servant were not made unavailing. The story of the Lambtons and their estates from 1830 to 1880 is much of a piece with the history of their class in these years.

⁶⁴*Ibid., passim.*

AGRARIAN ASPECTS OF EARLY VICTORIAN EMIGRATION
TO NORTH AMERICA

WILBUR S. SHEPPERSON

REAT BRITAIN was generally considered the wealthiest and most advanced nation of the nineteenth century, yet almost 17,000,000 of her citizens chose to emigrate in the period between Waterloo and Sarajevo. North America absorbed approximately 80 per cent of these migrants who were, in the first part of the period, drawn predominately from the agrarian classes. Works of broad scope, such as those by Stanley Johnson, Marcus Hansen, and Helen Cowan, have set forth the basic characteristics of this migration. The present study, therefore, is an attempt to view in greater detail a small but significant aspect of a familiar, yet many-sided movement. A series of similar specialized studies would perhaps bring out many salient features of Victorian emigration that have not yet been fully investigated, and might well lead to some revaluation of the subject as a whole.

The recurrent periods of agricultural distress in Britain during the second quarter of the nineteenth century led emigrant guides, newspapers, and periodicals, as well as British travellers and members of Parliament, to advocate emigration as a practical remedy for agrarian depression. The crop failures of the late thirties and forties, the sharp fluctuations in trade, the enclosures in northern England and Scotland, and the general lack of imagination shown in meeting social and economic problems all helped to foster an agrarian situation in which the need for emigration seemed pressing. At the same time the demand for agriculturists to settle the vast stretches of North American lands was equally pressing. It was farmers, not intellectuals, professionals, or industrial workers, who could be most easily assimilated into the new communities across the Atlantic.

The effects of Atlantic emigration and of migration to metropolitan areas began to be felt in rural England in the late 1820's. Several districts in the south of England, Cornwall and Wiltshire in the west, and in the east, Kent, Suffolk, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and the East Riding of Yorkshire, all began to report local areas of decreasing population. During the thirties, this decline in rural population made itself evident in all the counties of the east

and south coast, with the exception of Durham, Dorset, and Hampshire where the growth of industrial and shipping interests counteracted the agricultural losses.¹ Emigration was most in evidence in the counties of Sussex, Surrey, and Kent. The reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, the reports of the United States Consul in London, and the emigration projects of the Petworth and Dorking areas make plain the leading role that southeast England was playing in the rural exodus.² On the other hand, the Midlands and the Lake District, with the exception of Derby, had not, by the late thirties, experienced large-scale agrarian losses.

Between 1831 and 1841, emigration became more common throughout Scotland, depopulation being most severe in the Highlands and the Isles. In 1839, Dr. Thomas Rolph, the Upper Canadian physician, author, and immigration agent, published a letter addressed to His Grace, the Duke of Richmond, President of the Highlands and Agricultural Society of Scotland, to show that Scotland was undergoing the worst rural destitution in her history, and urging settlement in Canada as the remedy for the distress. Later Rolph did a great deal to promote such a migration.³

During the forties, when many of the rural counties of England and Scotland showed their greatest decreases in population, the emigration movement spread through almost the entire countryside. Especially notable were the departures from the southwestern English, central Welsh, and Scottish Highland counties.⁴ Although the fifties represented an era of economic improvement and a time when landlords and large farmers were generally prosperous, conditions for small farmers and agricultural labourers improved more slowly. The latter groups, encouraged by letters and financial aid from friends and relatives in America, continued to swell the tide of emigration.

The agrarian emigrants can be generally classified as gentry, farmers, and agricultural labourers. Of these the gentry and farmers went unassisted, their departures personally directed and individu-

¹Arthur Redford, *Labour Migration in England, 1800-50* (London, 1931), 150-1; Stanley C. Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912* (London, 1913), 47-8.

²House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *Eighth Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners*, (1842, XIX), 142; *Senate Document*, 24th Congress, 2nd Session, Serial no. 297, no. 5, Report from the Secretary of Treasury, Relative to Deportation of Paupers from Great Britain, 1836; *Emigration: Letters from Sussex Emigrants* (2nd ed., Petworth, 1833); Charles Barclay, ed., *Letters from the Dorking Emigrants Who Went to Upper Canada in the Spring of 1832* (London, 1833).

³Thomas Rolph, *Emigration and Colonization* (London, 1844), 6.

⁴Census of Great Britain, 1851, I, lxxvii; II, 1.

ally financed. The majority of the migrants, indeed, were unaided in their actual passage, but perhaps the assisted emigration was of greater social import and historical complexity. Agricultural labourers were assisted and encouraged to leave their homeland for various reasons, among them, to clear estates, to reduce poor rates, and to build up the sparsely settled colonies.

The core of the entire British agrarian structure was the farmer. He served not only as the lessee from the large landlord and as the employer of agricultural labourers, but also as the managing specialist who directed the manner and methods of tillage. His class occupied a position in rural society similar to that held earlier by England's "proud and sturdy" yeomanry. The emigration of farmers from Britain, while more difficult to trace, exceeded in numbers that of any other class of agriculturists. In the same way as the general migration, their pattern of departure started first from the southeast of England, spread out in a wave-like movement to the west of England by the early forties, and later expanded to Wales, the Midlands, and Scotland. In addition to this heavy emigration from specific areas, there were also scattered departures from all parts of the country.

Moving throughout the British countryside, stimulating the farmers' withdrawals, were agents representing public, private, corporate, and religious colonization enterprises. In Warwickshire, a member of Parliament who advocated a colonization society helped to foster the movement.⁵ Along the Tweed, the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Land Company enticed English and Scottish farmers to New Brunswick,⁶ while in Wiltshire the British-American Association stimulated interest in Upper Canada.⁷ E. F. Flower of Albion, Illinois, wrote letters to encourage the farmers near Stratford-upon-Avon to try the land of the prairies.⁸ The Reverend B. E. Chidlaw returned to Wales from Ohio to preach the virtues of America,⁹ at the same time as other religious teachers in Gloucestershire and Berkshire were converting many farmers to Mormonism as a prelude to emigration.¹⁰ Countless other deliberate efforts, as

⁵*The Times* (London), Dec. 15, 1848, 5. Francis Scott, M.P., was perhaps the chief promoter of the Colonization Society.

⁶James Brown, *New Brunswick, as a Home for Emigrants* (Saint John, N.B., 1860), 11-12.

⁷*Emigration Gazette and Colonial Advocate* (London), Nov. 28, 1842, no. 58, 5.

⁸Sidney's *Emigrant's Journal*, Jan. 25, 1849, no. 17, 134.

⁹R. W. Chidlaw, "Yr America," *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio*, VI, 1911, 7.

¹⁰*The Times*, Aug. 14, 1841, 6.

well as the inadvertent impetus given by depression, high rents, and crop failures, were working to dislodge the traditionally stable British farmer.

Because of the similarity in language, customs, and economic and political organization, the British emigrants were assimilated quickly into North American society. British farmers settled widely in the United States and the British North American colonies, but the rapid expansion of the second quarter of the century in both Upper Canada and the Old Northwest, where soil was fertile and land cheap, led to the greatest numbers going to those relatively undeveloped areas.

Each region of North America had its British advocates. Discussions were common in English and Scottish journals between persons who had never been west of the Severn or the Clyde as to whether the Galt, Peterborough, or Owen Sound area was the best place to go, and whether they were inferior or superior to Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin. The arguments were mainly academic, for thousands of British were flowing into both general regions.

Cultural and political ties led some British farmers to favour the North American colonies in preference to the United States. Large landowners, and particularly the Canada Company, encouraged this choice by offering liberal inducements for the purchase and settlement of their lands. These inducements especially attracted the Scots, who were inclined to prefer Canada, while the English farmer more often selected the United States or Australia. Emigration statistics clearly indicate this trend. In 1854, for example, 6,706 Scots emigrated to British North America and a slightly smaller number, 4,888, to the United States; in the same year only 6,064 English went to British North America compared with 37,644 to its southern neighbour.¹¹ Another tendency which appears clear in the agrarian migration is that the lower-class labouring groups and the sons of the gentry went rather more to the North American colonies, while middle-class independent yeomen were inclined to choose the republic.¹²

The individual departures of gentry from Britain composed, of course, the smallest division of the agrarian exodus. Major Strick-

¹¹House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *Fifteenth General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners* (1854-5, XVII, 1953), 66-9.

¹²Starting in 1854, "occupations of emigrants" charts were kept at British embarkation ports. Since occupation terms were unsystematically applied and Irish emigrant figures were included in the final lists, the records revealed little clarifying information.

land, for instance, fostered the emigration of several young English gentlemen to the Peterborough area, and these he trained in Canadian agriculture. Later, they purchased land of their own and became successful colonial farmers.¹³ Many in Britain thought that similar projects could be effectively undertaken if a colonial aristocracy were established. Emigrants from the gentry generally abhorred republican attitudes and doctrines and quite naturally wished to reproduce in British North America a miniature of the society they had known at home. Advocates of their emigration showed that an aristocracy was established in the Greek and Roman colonies. Statements were also extracted from speeches of Pitt, Fox, Burke, and Lord Grenville to show that they had originally proposed social organizations in the colonies identical with those in Britain. It was contended: "There are two things which always present themselves to the mind of an emigrant, and are always placed by him among the circumstances which are deemed to be reasons against expatriation. The one is the uncertainty that attends every step of his progress. The other is the inferiority of position which, as a colonist, he is to occupy."¹⁴

Some emigration promoters argued that the establishment of a "colonial baronage" was the answer to the Manchester School's contention that the colonies could not be held.¹⁵ An aristocracy would eliminate the possibility of Canada's becoming a republic, and save it from dropping from the tree. Capitalizing on the rivalry with the United States, these proponents suggested that an official upper class would allow the institutions of England to cover the globe, rather than produce offspring to thwart and oppose her.

Probably many among the upper class were less interested in the colonies as such than in securing an outlet for their sons who, because the church, army, navy, and law were overcrowded, had limited opportunities at home. One writer observed that sons of the gentry often became soured to the world by abstaining from marriage, while others married only to live in aristocratic poverty.¹⁶ Young blue bloods were encouraged—perhaps inspired—to emigrate by a 126-page, romantic poem, *The Emigrant's Reverie and Dream*. It told of a fifth son of an upper-class family who married the wrong girl, and was consequently disowned; whereupon he crossed

¹³Edwin Guillet, *The Great Migration* (Toronto, 1937), 30. The information was originally taken from the Cobourg Star of April 25, 1855.

¹⁴"Our Colonial Policy," *The Colonial and Asiatic Review*, I (1852), 94.

¹⁵*The British Colonies: Shall We Have a Colonial Baronage? or, Shall the Colonial Empire of Great Britain Be Resolved into Republics?* by a member of Parliament (London, 1852), 1.

¹⁶*Colonial Gazette* (London), Sept. 16, 1840, 617.

the Atlantic and led a hard life, but finally achieved happiness and prosperity.¹⁷

Opinions varied greatly as to the advisability of encouraging the upper class to leave. British travellers, such as Bonnycastle, Logan, and Matthew, thought that private gentlemen and the sons of the gentry made ideal settlers since they normally became successful in the New World.¹⁸ Logan stipulated that an emigrant gentleman should have at least £500 in ready funds. Kingston, an ardent supporter of colonies, suggested that, in order to assure the growth of communities with leaders of the British type, a temporary return to the old system of grants was urgently needed as the best way to attract gentry to colonial lands. He further thought that emigrants should be drawn from the two extremes of society, while the productive middle class should be encouraged to remain at home.¹⁹

Reports from many of the upper-class emigrants were not so optimistic as those of the armchair planners and hasty travellers, as witness the classic report of Mrs. Traill from the Canadian backwoods, which emphasized that any gentleman emigrating should have an independent income, and, since people came to better themselves, anyone having money and position at home could not benefit by coming. She emphatically stated that if gentlemen's sons were to succeed in the bush, they must chop trees and carry water.²⁰

These views coincided closely with a body of colonial opinion which sought to discourage the emigration of gentlemen. Publicizing and summarizing the attitude of many colonials, John Beverley Robinson told young gentlemen who had never worked at home and were acquainted only with idleness and dissipation to stay away from Canada as their type seldom improved with adventure.²¹ Such candid remarks from leading Canadians, coupled with the obvious privations and hardships consequent on emigration and settlement in the new world, led to a negligible influx of British aristocracy.

The emigration of the third group of agriculturists required considerable financial assistance. But the Poor Law of 1834 required,

¹⁷*The Emigrant's Reverie and Dream: England and America* (London, 1856).

¹⁸Richard H. Bonnycastle, *Canada and the Canadians* (London, 1849), I, 12; James Logan, *Notes of a Journey through Canada, the United States of America, and the West Indies* (Edinburgh, 1838), 57; Patrick Matthew, *Emigration Fields: North America, the Cape, Australia, and New Zealand* (Edinburgh, 1839), 20.

¹⁹William H. G. Kingston, *A System of General Emigration and . . . the Disposal of Convicts in the Colonies* (London, 1848), 15-16.

²⁰*The Backwoods of Canada: Being Letters from the Wife of an Emigrant Officer* (2nd ed., London, 1846), 131, 202.

²¹John Beverley Robinson, *Canada, and the Canadian Bill* (London, 1840), 33.

and the United States vigorously insisted, that such destitute persons, when aided by public funds be directed to the British colonies. Assistance to emigrant agricultural labourers stemmed from one of three sources: direct aid by the landlords, usually with a view to ridding their lands of pauperized tenants, help given through the Poor Law, and gifts and tickets commonly forwarded by friends or relatives in America. Very few English labourers emigrated by the first method. At the same time that English landlords financed migration from their Irish estates, they opposed the departure of their English workers. Exceptions, however, were the Earl of Egremont who in 1833 defrayed the expenses of two parties of Canada-bound emigrants from the parish of Petworth in Kent; the Earl of Heytesbury, who in 1837 sent out forty-five persons from his estates in Wiltshire; and a few other philanthropic English gentlemen, such as Arthur Mills who in 1846 took out a number of Warwickshire families and settled them on fifty-acre tracts in Canada.²² These examples were infrequent and isolated cases. Almost every year, however, some few individuals with their families were sent out through the combined aid of the local landlord and parish contributions.

Scotland, not having any system of Poor Law emigration until the fifties, and with many estates crowded with hundreds of people completely destitute and dependent upon public charity or the landowner for survival, specialized in landlord-financed migrations. By 1837, after years of misery and hardship in the Scottish Highlands, conditions became intolerable. It appeared literally to be a matter of starvation or mass emigration. Since Canada had not adopted the Wakefield plan of financing emigration and had become involved in rebellion, the British government supervised and for about four years helped finance Highland emigration to Australia. But the preference for Canada shown by the Scots, and the colonies' renewed encouragement of immigration starting in 1839 and 1840, again shifted the Highlanders' interest to the west.

On January 10, 1840, there was held at Edinburgh the first in a series of meetings by the Highland and Agricultural Society, a body composed of noblemen and gentlemen of Scotland, at which help for emigration was requested from the government.²³ Though the government refused to act, large landholders such as the Duke of Argyll, the Duke of Sutherland, Colonel Wyndham, and Neill

²²House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *Report from Agent for Emigration in Canada* (1838, XL, 389), 13; Arthur Mills, *Systematic Colonization* (London, 1847), 9; *Standard* (London), July 12, 1848, 4.

²³The *Times*, Jan. 14, 1840, 6.

Malcolm fostered the departure of hundreds of their tenantry.²⁴ By 1841, the Scottish landlords were sending over 700 persons a year to Canada. The figure rose to approximately 1000 a year for 1842 and 1843, but after these years the number fell markedly until the end of the decade.²⁵

The counties of Perth, Kinross, and Argyll decreased in population after 1831, Inverness after 1841, and Wigton, Kirkcudbright, Ross and Cromarty, and Sutherland after 1851.²⁶ Further proof of the exodus was quickly offered in Canada. During the winter of 1841, the St. Andrews Society of Montreal alone cared for 229 destitute emigrants who had just arrived from the barren Isle of Lewis.²⁷ Conditions in Scotland improved somewhat after 1843, but again became desperate in the late forties and early fifties. In 1851, 3,466 Scotsmen were aided by their landlords to emigrate to Canada.²⁸ The unusually large emigration in 1851 was due to the 986 persons who were sent out by Sir James Matheson from his newly acquired estates on Lewis, and the 1,681 sent by Colonel Gordon of Cluny from the islands of South Uist and Barra. These followed about 1000 others who had come from the Harris, Uist, Benbecula island chain in 1849.²⁹ Speaking no English and arriving in Canada late in the autumn, the Gordon emigrants of 1851 were kept from starvation only by the liberality of many charitable societies; however, the Canadian people were so aroused by the dumping of paupers upon their shores, and objected so vigorously that the number of assisted agrarian emigrants from Scotland did not exceed a few hundred a year for the remainder of the decade. Starting in 1852, with the founding of the Highlands and Islands Emigration Society by Sir Charles Trevelyan, rather more encouragement was given to the transporting of Highland paupers to Australia than to British North America.

The Poor Law of 1834 was the first concrete step in the realm of parish or official assistance to emigration. It granted statutory power

²⁴Not all the Scottish nobility furthered emigration. Earl Fife of Fifeshire, James Duff; the Baron of Panmure, William Maule, and his son who was in the House of Commons; and the Morpeths, a branch of the Howard family of Northumberland, were among the *élite* sometimes criticized for not following the lead of such southern Englishmen as the Earl of Devon and his son, Lord Courtenay, Lord Petre, and others who had shown an active interest in the subject of emigration.

²⁵House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, annual reports of the Poor Law Commissioners for respective years.

²⁶Census of Great Britain, 1851, 1861; see section devoted to Scotland.

²⁷John Murray Gibbon, *Scots in Canada* (London, 1911), 133.

²⁸House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *Twelfth General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners* (1852, XVIII, 1499), 48.

²⁹Ibid., *Emigration to British North America* (1852, XXXIII, 1474), 8-10.

to local poor-relief bodies to raise money on security of the rates which would enable them to meet the expense of sending out people from the parish.³⁰ Prior to 1834, there were isolated examples of English parishes granting money for emigration purposes, but the law of 1834 gave the first general instructions in the matter. While applying both to urban and rural areas, the emigration clause of the Poor Law was utilized almost exclusively by the country districts for the clearing out of surplus agricultural labourers.

Three hundred and twenty persons were sent to North America in the first year of the law's operation; some fifty of the number went to the United States in direct contradiction to the regulation which stated that parties emigrating should go to British colonies.³¹ For the year beginning July 1, 1835, 5,141 were sent out; the United States received over twice as many as in 1834, Australia welcomed a few scattered groups, her first immigration under the new Poor Law, while British North America absorbed the lion's share.³² From 1836 to 1845, 800 to 1000 persons were sent out each year. The later forties saw the number decline to approximately 200, rapidly rise in the early fifties to around 3000, then slowly drop after the middle fifties to only 55 persons by 1860.³³ The assisted migrations to the United States were discontinued in the later thirties as those to Australia increased. The latter country received a larger number of these migrants than British North America through the fifties.

During the earlier years of the Poor Law's operation, all but a scattered few of the Poor Law emigrants were sent from districts to the south and east of a line drawn from the mouth of the Severn to the Wash. By the early forties, the Welsh counties of Carmarthen and Merioneth, as well as Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire to the north, were beginning to make use of the Act, but Sussex, Kent, Suffolk, Somerset, Buckinghamshire, and Oxfordshire remained among the most active participants in Poor Law emigration. By December 31, 1860, 25,852 persons, the great bulk of whom were poor agriculturists, had emigrated under the authority of the Act of 1834.³⁴

In Scotland, even when a Board of Supervisors for the Relief of the Poor was set up in the mid-forties, no provision was made by it

³⁰4 & 5 Will. IV, c. 76, s. lxii.

³¹House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *First Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners* (1835, XXXV, 500).

³²*Ibid.*, *Second Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners* (1836, XXIX, 595).

³³*Ibid.*, *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Poor Law Board* (1861, XXVIII), 287.

³⁴*Ibid.* This figure seems to be in error; forty-seven who had emigrated were not included therein.

for emigration. In 1851, this deficiency was partially corrected through the Emigration Advances Act,³⁵ which allowed, on proper approval, funds set aside by the government for land improvements to be borrowed by landowners to defray the expense of sending out their tenants. In short, emigration, as well as draining and ditching, was deemed improvement to estates. Immediately, landlords throughout the Highlands made requests and received loans for such a clearance of their lands. Consequently, many of the Scottish emigrants sent out during the fifties were indirectly assisted by the government.

The extent to which private remittance from North America to friends in Britain contributed towards agrarian emigration cannot be accurately determined. Thousands, who otherwise would or could not have done so, were doubtless stimulated to leave their homes by the sums of money forwarded across the Atlantic. Fairly accurate figures on the amounts remitted through banks and mercantile houses were preserved, but they applied to the United Kingdom as a whole, and apparently a sizeable portion of the funds was directed to Ireland.³⁶ Nor was any estimate made of the amount of currency or the ship passages sent back to Britain through private channels, and indeed, it was never ascertained what part of the funds forwarded was used for actual emigration.

One source of remittance was from husbands and fathers, who frequently went alone to North America, and later sent for their families. In some cases, where the husband left for the United States, the wife, if on the poor rates, would ask to emigrate in order that she might join her spouse. The requests were at first granted, but later the practice became so common, since families adopted this means to accomplish emigration to the United States at parish expense, that this kind of help was discontinued. Males, however, often preceded their families. For instance, in 1844, 173 widows accompanied by 488 children and grandchildren passed through the port of Quebec to join sons or daughters, while 245 women with 713 children arrived to join their husbands.³⁷

³⁵14 & 15 Vict., c. 91.

³⁶Funds remitted from North America through banks and mercantile houses were upwards of £460,000 for 1848, £540,000 for 1849, £957,000 for 1850, £990,000 for 1851, £1,404,000 for 1852, £1,439,000 for 1853, £1,730,000 for 1854, £873,000 for 1855, £951,000 for 1856, £593,165 for 1857, £472,610 for 1858, £575,378 for 1859, and £577,932 for 1860. See appropriate yearly reports of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners.

³⁷C.O. 384/61, Emigration: North America, 1840; House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, *Fifth General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners* (1845, XXVII, 617), 36.

As could be expected in a politically independent society, British farmers voluntarily emigrated in the hope of bettering their economic and social position. To many it seemed that the fertile regions of North America were a poor man's utopia and the only escape from the lengthy and recurring depressions. Many who were not ready to leave in the thirties were dislodged by the "hungry forties." If they still clung to land, Queen, and country, the "fitful fifties" served to convince them that only in North America, where the hogs were fattened on ripe peaches and meat was eaten three times a day, where there were no tithes, few landlords, and low taxes, could a poor farmer with willing hands provide for himself and create a future for his family.

The emigration of British gentry, offshoots of the nobility, and retired military and naval officers, was also an individual matter. They, like the farmer, were motivated by a desire to enhance their own or their families' station in life, or by their reluctance to accept a reduced economic or social position at home.

The emigration assistance given to agricultural labourers sprang from a mixture of philanthropic, patriotic, and selfish motives. It served the landlords' economic advantage to clear their estates while most of them also felt a responsibility to aid in the resettlement of hereditary tenants. When this could be done by directing the migrants to a British territory, all three motives were served. The government promoted emigration with a similar mixture of purpose. Politically, the government hoped to guide British subjects to British colonies; economically, it planned to relieve the parish poor rates; and philanthropically, it desired to give limited humanitarian aid.

Fundamentally, however, public and private assistance, while relieving some persons of hardships and helping certain individuals, represented a belated type of Malthusianism. It was an effort to ameliorate conditions through an essentially negative philosophy; whereas the adoption of a positive programme would have tended to make emigration unnecessary as a sheer escape from hunger.

GRADUATE THESES IN CANADIAN HISTORY AND RELATED SUBJECTS

The CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW presents herewith its twenty-fifth annual list of graduate theses which are in course of preparation or have recently been completed. Included in the list are titles not only in Canadian history but also in such related subjects as Canada's external relations, Canadian economics, law, and geography, and a selection of historical titles which bear indirectly rather than directly on Canadian history.

We wish to express our appreciation of the generous co-operation which we have received from a large number of universities throughout the British Commonwealth, the United States, and Canada, in the compilation of this information. We shall be very grateful to have mistakes or omissions drawn to our attention.

Theses for the Doctor's Degree

NATHANIEL C. ALLYN, A.B. Stanford 1948; A.M. 1949. History of Canadian immigration 1932-52. *Stanford*.

HOWARD K. AMMERMAN, S.B. Kentucky 1941; A.M. Chicago 1950. Canadian devaluation, 1949. *Chicago*.

WALTON J. ANDERSON, B.Sc. Saskatchewan 1942; M.Sc. 1944. The economic efficiency of British Columbian agriculture. *Chicago*.

D. G. ANGLIN, B.A. Toronto 1948; Oxford 1950. Canadian policy towards international institutions since 1939. *Oxford*.

MARGARET A. BANKS, B.A. Bishop's 1949; M.A. Toronto 1950. Edward Blake and Irish nationalism. *Toronto*.

B. D. BARGAR, B.A. Miami 1946; M.A. Ohio State 1947; Ph.D. Toronto 1952. The administration of Lord Dartmouth in the American Department. *Toronto*.

R. N. BEATTIE, B.A. British Columbia 1939; M.A. Toronto 1946. The Grand Trunk Railway to 1867. *Toronto*.

THEODORE BEAUCHAMP, B.Litt. Montréal 1926; B.Theol. 1932; M.A. Fordham 1949. Probation systems in Canada. *Fordham*.

RUBEN CARL BELLAN, B.A. Manitoba 1938; M.A. Toronto 1941. Business fluctuations in Winnipeg from 1900 to 1939. *Columbia*.

HENRY BORZO, B.A. University of Washington 1938; M.A. Loyola 1947. *The Times* (London) and imperialism, 1850-1900. *Chicago*.

BORIS CELOVSKI, B.A. Czechoslovakia 1942; M.A. Montréal 1951. L'historiographie canadienne-française dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle. *Montréal*.

DOROTHY P. CLARKE. The attitude of the Colonial Office to the working of responsible government, 1854-68. *London*.

J. A. COLVIN, B.A. Toronto 1949. Imperial conferences, 1897-1902. *London*.

P. G. CORNELL, B.A. Toronto 1940; M.A. 1948. The alignment of political parties in the united province of Canada. *Toronto*.

ROSARIO COUSINEAU, B.A. Montréal 1929; L.Sc. 1932; M.Sc. Columbia 1934; Ph.D. Ottawa 1952. Politique commerciale extérieure du Canada: histoire, fondements, orientation. *Ottawa*.

HARRY SHERMAN CROWE, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. Toronto 1948. The state and economic life in Canada. *Columbia*.

DONALD J. DALY, B.A. Queen's 1943; M.A. 1948; Ph.D. Chicago 1952. Forecasting Canadian federal tax yields. *Chicago*.

HEATHER M. DONALD. Lord Mount Stephen, 1829-1921. *London*.

EARL GORDON DRAKE, B.A. Saskatchewan 1950; M.A. 1951. Walter Scott's career as Premier of Saskatchewan, 1905-16. *Toronto*.

WILLIAM MALCOLM DRUMMOND, B.A. Queen's 1923; M.A. Toronto 1924; A.M. Harvard 1951. An economic analysis of the Canadian dairy industry. *Harvard*.

FRANCIS DUNCAN, B.A. Ohio Wesleyan 1943; M.A. Chicago 1947. History of the Detroit and Cleveland Lake Transportation Company. *Chicago*.

HARRY CLAUDE MACCOLL EASTMAN, B.A. Toronto 1947; A.M. Chicago 1949. Post-war Canadian commercial policy. *Chicago*.

WALTER DONALD ELDON, B.A. Western Ontario 1948; A.M. Harvard 1951; Ph.D. 1952. American influence in the Canadian iron and steel industry. *Harvard*.

S. G. ELLSWORTH, B.A. Utah State Agricultural College 1941; Ph.D. California 1951. A History of Mormon missions in the United States and Canada, 1830-60. *California*.

D. M. L. FARR, B.A. British Columbia 1944; M.A. Toronto 1946. The Colonial Office and Canada, 1867-87. *Oxford*.

ROBERT BARRY FARRELL, B.A. Queen's 1947; A.M. Harvard 1948. The planning and development of foreign policy in Canada, with significant American and British contrasts. *Harvard*.

C. B. FERGUSON, B.A. Dalhousie 1935; M.A. Oxford 1941. The colonial policy of Charles Jenkinson, Baron Hawkesbury and the first Earl of Liverpool, as President of the Committee for Trade, 1784-1800. *Oxford*.

PAUL WESLEY FOX, B.A. Toronto 1944; M.A. 1947. Political philosophy in France and New France, 1600-1763. *London*.

G. S. FRENCH, B.A. Toronto 1944; M.A. 1948. Methodism and politics in Canada in the nineteenth century. *Toronto*.

I. B. GOODMAN, B.Com. Toronto 1945; Ph.D. California 1950. Some aspects of Canadian commercial policy, 1930-49. *California*.

ANGELA A. HANNAN, B.A. Toronto 1923; M.A. 1925. David Mills. *Toronto*.

ERIC J. HANSEN, B.A. Queen's 1942; M.A. Alberta 1946. A financial history of Alberta, 1905-50. *Alberta*.

JOHN P. HEISLER, B.A. British Columbia 1939; M.A. McGill 1941. Sir John Thompson, 1844-94. *Toronto*.

PAUL H. HEPPE, A.B. Wisconsin 1939; A.M. 1948. The ideology of the Canadian Liberal party 1921-51. *Wisconsin*.

GORDON K. HIRABAYASHI, B.A. University of Washington 1946; M.A. 1949; Ph.D. 1951. The Russian Doukhobors of British Columbia: A study of social adjustment and conflict. *University of Washington*.

C. F. W. HOOPER, B.A. Toronto 1947; M.A. Harvard 1948. Political ideas in the Canadian constitution. *Oxford*.

SYDNEY W. JACKMAN, B.S. Washington 1946; M.A. 1947; A.M. Harvard 1948. Biography of Sir Francis Head. *Harvard*.

RAYMOND CASIMIR JANCAUKAS, A.B. Loyola 1936; M.A. St. Louis 1940. Analysis of recent major Canadian investments. *Columbia*.

RALPH KAMINSKY, B.A. Manitoba 1947. Canadian experience in foreign exchange control. *Columbia*.

M. R. KINGSFORD, M.A. Cambridge 1924. Constitutional history of the Church of England in Canada. *Oxford*.

R. L. KIRKPATRICK, B.A. Monmouth College 1942; M.A. Washington 1947. British imperial policy, 1874-80. *Oxford*.

ROLAND LAMONTAGNE, B.A. Montréal 1943; M.A. 1951. L'œuvre colonisatrice de Jean Talon en Nouvelle-France. *Montréal*.

FRANCIS HOLMES LEACY, B.A. British Columbia 1941. Price behaviour in Canadian business cycles. *Columbia*.

CHARLES LEMELIN, B.A. Levis College 1938; B.S.A. Laval 1942; M.P.A. Harvard 1949; A.M. 1951; Ph.D. 1952. Agricultural development and industrialization of Quebec. *Harvard*.

A. D. LOCKHART, B.A. Queen's 1930; M.A. 1931. The administration and development of Ontario under Sir James Whitney. *Toronto*.

MALCOLM MACDONELL, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1938; M.A. Toronto 1945. The administration of Sir John Harvey in the Maritime Provinces. *Toronto*.

WILLIAM MACKENZIE, B.Sc. Glasgow 1946; B.Litt. Oxford 1948; M.S. Cornell 1949. An examination of capital formation and substitution in the agriculture of Alberta. *Harvard*.

K. A. MACKIRDY, B.A. British Columbia 1947; M.A. 1948. Regionalism: Canada and Australia. *Toronto*.

JOHN MCKNIGHT, B.S.S. College of the City of New York 1939; A.M. Columbia 1947. United States-Canadian trade, 1932-8: A study in the income and expenditure approach to the theory of international trade. *Columbia*.

DAVID ROSS MCLELLAN, B.Sc. Chicago 1942; M.A. Ottawa 1945; Ph.D. 1952. Canadian Government procurement. *Ottawa*.

K. D. MCRAE, B.A. Toronto 1946; M.A. Harvard 1947. Some social and political ideas of the Canadian reformers. *Oxford*.

A. F. MADDEN, M.A. Oxford 1946; Ph.D. 1950. The attitude of the Evangelicals to the Empire and imperial problems (1820-50). *Oxford*.

Sœur MARIE-DE-SAINT-JEAN-D'ARS, c.s.c., B.A. Montréal 1940; M.A. 1950. Claude Dablon, s.j. *Montréal*.

J. S. MOIR, B.A. Toronto 1948; M.A. 1949. The rebellion of 1837 in Upper Canada. *Toronto*.

R. N. MONTGOMERY. History of the schisms and unions of the United Presbyterian Church in North America. *Edinburgh*.

RUSSELL MORRISON, B.A. Saskatchewan 1944; M.A. Toronto 1947. Trends in Canadian wheat policy. *Chicago*.

Sister M. TERESA AVILA BURKE, A.B. College of New Rochelle 1940; A.M. Columbia 1947. The early history of the Canadian federal cabinet. *Columbia*.

E. E. MURPHY, B.A. Texas 1946; LL.B. 1948. A comparative legal study of the war power in the constitutions of Australia, Canada, and the United States of America. *Oxford*.

SYDNEY G. PETTIT, B.A. British Columbia 1936; M.A. 1945. The judiciary in the colonial period of Vancouver Island and British Columbia. *University of Washington*.

A. T. PHILLIPS, B.A. Manitoba 1943; M.A. 1948. J. W. Dafoe and Canadian liberalism. *Toronto*.

ROBERT GERALD PRODRICK, B.A. Toronto 1938; M.A. 1950. The emergence of public enterprise in the Canadian economy. *Columbia*.

ALLANA G. REID, B.A. McGill 1943; M.A. 1945; Ph.D. 1950. The growth and importance of the city of Quebec, 1608-1760. *McGill*.

GIDEON ROSENBLUTH, B.A. Toronto 1943. Industrial concentration in post-war Canada. *Columbia*.

V. ROSS, B.A. McGill 1924; M.A. 1926; B.S. Columbia 1937. The influence of printed matter in Lower Canada, 1760-1815. *McGill*.

FREDERICK W. ROWE, B.A. Mount Allison 1941; B.Paed. Toronto 1949; D.Paed. 1951. The history of education in Newfoundland. *Toronto*.

JOHN TUPPER SAYWELL, B.A. British Columbia 1950; M.A. 1951. The Canadian lieutenant-governor: An historical study of forms and forces. *Harcard*.

GISÈLE SEVENSTER, B.A. Montréal 1947; M.A. 1948. La vie et l'œuvre de Jacques Cartier. *Montréal*.

GORDON W. SMITH, B.A. Alberta 1944; M.A. 1948. Historical background of Canada's Arctic claims. *Columbia*.

W. D. SMITH, B.A. Manitoba 1948; M.A. 1951. The history of the negotiations regarding the St. Lawrence Seaway. *Toronto*.

JOHN B. STEWART, B.A. Acadia 1945; M.A. 1946. The Canadian House of Commons and the war, 1939-45. *Chicago*.

W. H. STUART, B.A. British Columbia 1947; B.Ed. 1947; M.A. 1949. Canadian opinion of the United States between 1837 and 1876. *Toronto*.

MAX B. THATCHER, B.S. California 1935; A.M. 1936. Political issues in Quebec: A study in Canadian federalism. *Northwestern*.

LEWIS G. THOMAS, B.A. Alberta 1934; M.A. 1935. Political and economic history of Alberta, 1905-21. *Harvard*.

FRANCIS F. THOMPSON, B.A. Dalhousie 1944; M.A. 1945. The local background of the Newfoundland clauses of the Anglo-French Agreement, 1904. *Oxford*.

HOWARD A. VERNON, A.B. Chicago 1937; A.M. 1940; Ph.D. 1951. French Canadians in the French Revolution. *Chicago*.

P. B. WAITE, B.A. British Columbia 1948; M.A. 1950. Federalism at the time of Confederation. *Toronto*.

BERNARD WEILBRENNER, B.A. Montréal 1949; M.A. 1951. Les explorations des La Vérendrye. *Montréal*.

DOROTHY JANE WOODWARD, B.A. Toronto 1947; M.A. 1949. Adjustment of the Iroquois to urban white society in Sarnia, Ontario. *Wisconsin*.

J. H. YOUNG, B.A. Queen's 1948; M.A. 1949. Strategic factors in Canadian economic development. *Cambridge*.

M. ZASLOW, B.A. Alberta 1941; B.Ed. 1942; M.A. Toronto 1948. A history of transportation and development of the Mackenzie basin from 1921 to 1948. *Toronto*.

Theses for the Master's Degree

MISS E. ABBOTT, B.A. Queen's 1937. The career of Sir John Abbott. *Queen's*.

FRÈRE ADELARD-MARIE, s.g., B.A. Montréal 1949. Monseigneur Bourget: premières années d'épiscopat, 1837-42. *Montréal*.

ROY H. ALLIN, B.A. Western Ontario 1927. Henri Bourassa's philosophy of nationalism and its practical applications to 1914. *Western Ontario*.

H. P. ANDREWS, B.A. Toronto 1947; M.A. 1950. The social structure of the Jewish community in Toronto. *Oxford*.

F. G. BAILEY, B.A. Oxford 1948. The political organization of the Plains Indians. *Oxford*.

K. C. BINKS, B.A. Queen's 1948. Analysis of French-Canadian opinion on the changing structure of the Commonwealth. *Queen's*.

JEAN-JACQUES BISAUILLON, B.A. Montreal College 1943; LL.D. University of Montreal 1947. History of trade unions in Canada. *Columbia*.

JOHN T. BLANCHARD, LL.B. British Columbia 1951. Extradition between Canada and the United States. *Harvard*.

D. H. BOCKING, B.A. Saskatchewan 1950; B.Ed. 1950. A study of the editorial views of the *Regina Leader* on Dominion policy in relation to public works in the Territories. *Saskatchewan*.

YVON BOLDUC, B.Com. Ottawa 1951; M.A. 1952. Les objectifs de la politique économique du Canada (1920-50). *Ottawa*.

DENIS BOUSQUET, B.A. Montréal 1948. Le Canada et la guerre des brochures. *Montréal*.

JACQUES BRAZEAU, B.A. McGill 1949; M.A. 1951. The French-Canadian doctor in Montreal: A study of careers within a profession. *McGill*.

M. WALKER BROLEY, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1948; LL.B. Dalhousie 1951; LL.M. Harvard 1952. Union security in Canada. *Harvard*.

WILLARD B. BROWN, Jr., A.B. Columbia 1949. The Canadian Combines Investigations Act. *Columbia*.

GEOFFREY FRANKLIN BRUCE, B.A. Queen's 1947. Development of Canada's old age security programme. *Columbia*.

R. F. BUNN, B.A. Southwestern 1951. The family allowance system in Canada. *Duke*.

A. J. BUTT, B.A. London 1947. The social organization of the central and eastern Eskimos. *Oxford*.

STEPHEN CANELLIS, A.B. Brooklyn College 1949. United States-Canadian relations since 1930. *New York University*.

JOHN ROGERS CARROLL, B.A. Dalhousie 1936; M.A. 1950. Public school education in Nova Scotia, 1840-1935. *Dalhousie*.

J. K. CHAPMAN, B.A. New Brunswick 1950. Relations of Maine and New Brunswick in the era of Reciprocity, 1849-1867. *New Brunswick*.

C. M. CHESNEY, B.A. Saskatchewan 1950. The nature, scope, and organization of the Canadian contribution to the Allied food supply in World War II, with particular reference to animal products. *Saskatchewan*.

ROBERT CHOPLIN, B.A. Caen 1943. Un mouvement français d'expansion coloniale au XVIIe siècle: la fondation de Montréal. *Montréal*.

E. A. CHRISTIE, B.A. Toronto 1946. The *Christian Guardian* and its attitude to public affairs, 1896-1918. *Toronto*.

L. C. CLARK, B.A. Manitoba 1948; M.A. 1952. An examination of the first year of Macdonald's return to power. *Queen's*.

GORDON CLUETT, B.A. Queen's 1951. Tactics and strategy of the Liberal party in Manitoba, 1895-1905. *Queen's*.

E. J. COLAS, B.Eng. McGill 1946; B.A. Ottawa 1947; B.C.L. McGill 1949; M.C.L. 1951. The development of the concept of legal personality and trade unions in Canada. *McGill*.

JOHN E. CRAIG, B.A. Manitoba 1951. Public opinion in Manitoba and the approach to war, 1931-9. *Toronto*.

BRIAN A. S. CRANE, B.A. British Columbia 1950. Canada and the U.N. (Palestine and Korea). *Columbia*.

JOSEPH BRUCE CREECH, B.A. Western Ontario 1949. A history of the London, Huron, and Bruce Railway. *Western Ontario*.

B. N. CROMPTON, B.A. Oxford 1950. A study of the nature and effects of missionary activity among the Indians in Upper Canada during the early nineteenth century, as illustrated by the records of certain missionary societies. *Oxford*.

RONALD J. DOWNIE, B.A. Saint Mary's College 1948; LL.B. Dalhousie 1951; LL.M. Harvard 1952. Status of a collective agreement at law and under statute (Canada). *Harvard*.

EARL GORDON DRAKE, B.A. Saskatchewan 1950; M.A. 1951. The territorial press in the region of present-day Saskatchewan, 1878 to 1915. *Saskatchewan*.

W. J. ECCLES, B.A. McGill 1949; M.A. 1951. Jean Bochart de Champigny, Intendant of New France, 1686-1702. *McGill*.

Frère ELOI, s.g., B.A. Montréal 1949. La monnaie de carte en 1759. *Montréal*.

G. A. FORD. Hudson's Bay Company: Exploration, development, settlement. *London*.

Frère FRANÇOIS-GEORGES, i.c., B.A. Montréal 1950. Le budget du Bas-Canada, 1782-1837. *Montréal*.

Sœur Sainte GERTRUDE-DE-LA-CROIX, L.Péd. Laval 1951. L'œuvre pedagogique de Marguerite-Bourgeois. *Laval*.

D. E. GRAY, B.A. Queen's 1945; M.A. 1952. The building of the Rideau Canal. *Queen's*.

THOMAS HARDIE, B.A. Montréal 1946. Céloron de Blainville. *Montréal*.

J. T. HART, B.A. Emory and Henry College 1951. The communist movement in Canada. *Duke*.

JAMES HARVEY HASSARD, B.A. Western Ontario 1948. The economic and social development of the northern townships of Halton County, Ontario. *Western Ontario*.

MAURICE HEROUX, B.A. Montréal 1951. Le Canada et la guerre de 1914. *Montréal*.

W. N. HIGHAM, B.A. Queen's 1950; M.A. Toronto 1951. The Laurier-Borden naval controversy. *Toronto*.

IAN ALBERT HODSON, B.A. Western Ontario 1950; M.A. 1952. Commercial Union and the background of the election of 1891. *Western Ontario*.

Père J.-O. BÉCIN, s.j., B.A. Laval 1932. Le P. Jérôme Lalemant, supérieur des missions huronnes. *Montréal*.

J. A. JOHNSTON, B.A. Western Ontario 1950; M.A. McGill 1951. The Presbyterian College, Montreal, 1865-1915. *McGill*.

HUGUETTE JOLICŒUR, B.A. Montréal 1949. Etude sur *Le Canadien. Montréal*.

WALTER KARASHOWSKY, B.A. Alberta 1948. The career of the Honourable Harry H. Stevens, with especial reference to the election of 1935. *Queen's*.

M. W. KERR, B.A. Western Australia 1947. A study of opinion in the British Parliament concerning the colonies, 1850-60. *Oxford*.

DAVID GOLDIE KILCOUR, B.A. Toronto 1946; Osgoode Hall 1949; LL.M. Harvard 1952. Federalism and the income tax: United States and Canada. *Harvard*.

ROBERT C. LANGMAN, B.A. Toronto 1949. The geography of east-central Ontario: A study in the evolution of settlement patterns. *Toronto*.

T. E. LAYNG, B.A. Queen's 1948. American influences on Canadian education, 1791-1850. *Queen's*.

Soeur LEFEBVRE, h.s.j., B.A. Montréal 1949. Le Sr Morin et les *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal. Montréal*.

MEYER LEVADIE, B.A. Manitoba 1950; M.A. 1952. John W. Dafoe and the evolution of Canadian autonomy, 1918-26. *Manitoba*.

T. W. LIGHTFOOT, B.A. Toronto 1950. Haldimand and the Quebec Act. *Toronto*.

C. ELIZABETH LOFFT, B.A. Toronto 1949; M.A. Western Ontario 1951. The election of 1896 in western Ontario. *Western Ontario*.

D. E. MACFEE, B.A. Queen's 1947. The career of the Honourable William Macdougall. *Queen's*.

D. G. MCGILLIVRAY, B.A. Saskatchewan 1951. Political attitudes towards economic development in Saskatchewan, 1905-29. *Saskatchewan*.

K. G. MACKAY, B.C.L. McGill 1950; M.C.L. 1951. The Water Carriage of Goods Act, 1936. *McGill*.

HELEN McMAHON, B.A. Toronto 1948. The career of John Sandfield Macdonald. *Queen's*.

Sister MARGARET MALLOY, B.A. Manitoba 1941; B.Ed. 1948; M.Ed. 1952. The history of St. Mary's Academy and College and its times. *Manitoba*.

E. F. J. MATHEWS, B.Sc. London 1944. Poole's trade with Newfoundland, 1750-1830. *Bristol*.

S. R. MEALING, B.A. Alberta 1949; Oxford 1951. Lt.-Gov. John Graves Simcoe, and the Home Office, 1791-7. *Oxford*.

R. E. MILLER, B.A. Queen's 1951. Nationalism in the politics of Quebec, 1895-1911. *Queen's*.

R. L. MOSHER, B.A. Acadia 1949; M.A. 1951. The party pattern in Nova Scotia, 1867-1911. *Queen's*.

VIOLET NELSON, B.A. Queen's 1948; M.A. 1951. The Orange Order in Canadian life. *Queen's*.

RUTH NICHOLSON, B.A. New Brunswick 1951. Relations of Maine and New Brunswick, 1837-49. *New Brunswick*.

R. C. OERTEL, A.B. James Milliken University 1948; A.M. Illinois 1951. History of Newfoundland's union with Canada. *Illinois*.

J. B. PALMER, B.A. McMaster 1936. Agricultural o-operation in Ontario. *McMaster*.

A. PETRIE, B.A. McMaster 1946. Settlement of Welland County, 1776-1812. *McMaster*.

JOHN A. PHILP, B.A. Western Ontario 1949. The social and economic influence of British regiments in western Ontario, 1825-67. *Western Ontario*.

HUGH D. PORTER, B.A. Queen's 1947. Kingston and the American Civil War. *Queen's*.

JACQUES POULIN, B.A. Montréal 1947. Dollier de Casson. *Montréal*.

BRUCE A. POWE, B.A. Alberta 1949; M.A. 1951. The Alberta interim programme and the Treasury branches. *Alberta*.

VIATEUR RAVARY, B.A. Montréal 1949. La vérité historique dans l'œuvre du baron de La Hontan. *Montréal*.

MARGARET V. RAY, B.A. Toronto 1922. Sudeten settlement in Western Canada. *Toronto*.

ANDREW WILSON RENFREW, A.B. Wayne 1949. Copperhead and Confederate conspiracies on the Detroit-Canadian border. *Wayne*.

RALPH REYNOLDS, B.A. Queen's 1949. Social history of Upper Canada during the 1850's. *Queen's*.

HEW L. ROBERTSON, B.A. Queen's 1950; M.A. 1952. The Ultramontanes in the public life of Quebec, 1867-91. *Queen's*.

E. D. ROSS, B.A. New Brunswick 1951. The political life of Charles Fisher of New Brunswick. *New Brunswick*.

JEAN-NOËL ROULEAU, B.A. Montréal 1950. La correspondance de Madame Bégon. *Montréal*.

J. P. SCANLON, B.A. Queen's 1951. An examination of the elections in the political crisis of 1925-6. *Queen's*.

IRA SINGER, A.B. New York University 1951. Some aspects of participation of U.S. citizens in the Canadian rebellion of 1837-8. *New York University*.

A. D. SMALL, B.A. Toronto 1946. J. W. Dafoe and the *Winnipeg Free Press*. *Toronto*.

ALEX SMITH, B.A. Alberta 1940; LL.B. 1941. The commerce clause in the American and Canadian constitutions: A comparative study. *Stanford*.

ELIZABETH SMITH, B.A. McMaster 1950. The career of Beverley Robinson. *Queen's*.

SIDNEY J. SPIVAK, LL.B. Manitoba 1951; LL.M. Harvard 1952. A study of the treaty power of Canada and the United States. *Harvard*.

ETHEL STEWART, B.A. Queen's 1948. A history of the Mackenzie River valley. *Queen's*.

EARL G. THOMAS, B.A. New Brunswick; M.A. Queen's 1951. Macdonald in Opposition, 1873-8. *Queen's*.

BERNARD VINET, B.A. Montréal 1950. François-Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil. *Montréal*.

WILLIAM MORRIS WEEKES, B.A. Carleton 1951. The relations between civil and military administration in Upper Canada. *Western Ontario*.

HUGH J. WHALEN, B.A. New Brunswick 1949; M.A. Alberta 1951. The distinctive legislation of the government of Alberta, 1935-47. *Alberta*.

PATRICIA WHITEHEAD, B.A. London 1947. Lord Dalhousie's policies while Governor-General. *Queen's*.

W. H. WHITELY, B.A. British Columbia 1951. Canadian opinion on American expansionism, 1895-1903. *Queen's*.

OWEN WILLIAMS, B.A. University College of Wales 1949. The War of the Spanish Succession in North America, 1702-17. *University College of Wales*.

R. A. WILLIAMS, B.A. University College of Wales 1949; M.A. 1951. The Dominions and the Italo-Abyssinian conflict. *University College of Wales*.

A. ARNOTT WILSON, B.A. Western Ontario 1949. The industrial development of the Port Colborne area. *Western Ontario*.

S. F. WISE, B.A. Toronto 1950. The use of the Indians by the British in the War of the American Revolution. *Queen's*.

A. W. WOOD, B.A. Saskatchewan 1951; B.S.A. 1951. A study of productivity in Canadian agriculture. *Saskatchewan*.

DOREEN M. YORKSTON, B.A. British Columbia 1948; A.M. Clark 1952. Canada as a middle power, 1839-49. *Clark*.

D. M. YOUNG, B.A. New Brunswick 1949. Sir Howard Douglas. *Toronto*.

REVIEW ARTICLE

CANADA AND COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS*

D. J. McDougall

THIS is a somewhat unusual list of books to be dealt with in an article on this subject. The titles themselves suggest the range of material that may be included in a study of the Commonwealth; and the variety of subjects with which they deal makes it difficult to find a common factor around which they can be united. A number of them are short historical studies of communities that have been, or that continue to be portions of the Commonwealth. They include three new volumes in Hutchinson's University Library under the editorship of Sir Maurice Powicke. Among these Professor Crawford's *History of Australia* is an outstanding addition to the series. A little volume published by the Hansard Society provides an admirable conspectus of the history and working of parliamentary government in the dominions and in the Republic of India; and Miss Harvey's study of *Consultation and Co-operation* explains in detail the methods by which the various governments of the Commonwealth agree to disagree, or to pool their talents and resources for the solution of common problems. The most important book dealing with contemporary or near contemporary events is Mr. Campbell-Johnson's *Mission with Mountbatten*, an absorbing study of the last days of British rule in India, and a book that will take its place at once as a historical source of the greatest significance.

It will be convenient to deal first with the more purely historical studies. Mr. Brock's *Britain and the Dominions* is a general history of the British Empire from the first voyages of discovery to the present time. It is the first of a series of such volumes planned by the Cambridge University Press for the use of what are here described as "young students"; and if it cannot be considered one of the outstanding histories of the Empire, it will probably be very useful for the purpose for which it is designed. The author clearly has a wide knowledge of his subject, and his material is presented in a manner that will make his book an excellent introduction to the histories of the several dominions that are to follow.

The book is described as "the history of an idea—the unique concept of dominion status within a commonwealth of nations"; and it is this idea that informs his work throughout. In each of the four sections into which the book is divided, the author explains developments in Britain which have a bearing on the fortunes of the overseas communities, and then proceeds to deal with "The Problems of Empire" under various heads, which serve to illustrate the political, economic, and social development of the several colonies and dependencies. The method results in some overlapping, but it has the merit of clarity and simplicity.

*This is the twenty-first review article published by the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW on this subject. For the bibliography of this article see page 283. The REVIEW also publishes in each issue a list of recent publications on Canada's relations within the Commonwealth (see page 299).

There are some curious omissions. The section on Ireland in the eighteenth century, which rightly describes that community as a dependent colony, makes no reference to the experiment in self-government under Grattan's Parliament; and the chapter on responsible government in Canada contains no mention of the work of Baldwin and Lafontaine in evolving this concept and demonstrating its practicability. For Mr. Brock, as for most English writers, the resplendent figure of Lord Durham tends to obscure some of the essential facts.

The danger of attempting to write the history of anything so complex as the British Empire around a single idea is that the author may be tempted to carry the idea into periods when it either did not exist, or had virtually no influence on the development that he is recording. Mr. Brock has not escaped that danger; but he has written a book that may help to put an end to the tedious complaints of so many English writers as to the ignorance of the British public about their imperial heritage.

Just how the idea of self-government, as it was coming to be understood in Canada and Nova Scotia in the 1840's, was extended to other parts of the Empire is succinctly demonstrated in Mr. Carrington's biography of John Robert Godley, one of the less prominent members of the group of "colonial reformers," who played an important part in the organization and establishment of the colony of Canterbury in the south island of New Zealand. Godley was an unusual figure. The son of an Irish landlord and a high Tory in politics, he was at once a friend of Gladstone, an ardent supporter of the religious ideas of Pusey and Newman, an advocate of colonial reform as recommended by Lord Durham, and for many years a close associate of Gibbon Wakefield. A visit to Toronto in 1843, where he was the guest of Sir Charles Bagot, gave him an insight into the meaning and possibilities of responsible government; and in his later years in New Zealand he did much to lay the foundations of a similar type of government there. His vigorous assertion of the rights of the colonial settlers brought him into conflict at once with the Governor, Sir George Grey, and with the London directors of the Canterbury Association. In the end Wakefield, who had chosen him to direct the settlement, professed to regard him as of unsound mind, which evidently meant no more than that he had come to disagree with the master on a number of questions concerning the life of this model Wakefield community.

Canterbury was the most successful of the many experiments in planned colonization during the middle years of the century; and Mr. Carrington's book, written to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the settlement, is the most scholarly account that has been published. The success was due in part to careful planning by Wakefield and to the generous support given by Lord Littleton and some other sponsors. But it was due also in large measure to the labours of Godley, who for three years personally directed the original settlements at Christchurch and Littleton. His work deserves to be remembered; and this biography is a worthy tribute at once to his achievements, and to the high moral purpose which characterized all his undertakings.

Professor Crawford's account of the settlement of Australia presents a curious contrast to the record of the foundation of Canterbury. He has to deal, not with the carefully selected emigrants, possessed of sufficient means to acquire land on the terms laid down by Wakefield, and able, or so it was believed, to reproduce in New Zealand an exact parallel of English rural society, but with

the criminal and the unfortunate, dispatched to the other end of the world, without plan or forethought, merely to rid society of a nuisance which could be disposed of in no other way. It is estimated that about 160,000 convicts were sent to Australia before the system of transportation was ended; and the description here given of the conditions under which these people lived, in Britain and in their new homes, is as fine as anything that has been written in similar compass. There appears to have been little plan or method. What happened to the convict, whether he remained in some form of captivity or was assigned to the charge of a free proprietor, seems to have been entirely a matter of chance; and the remarkable thing is that the problem worked itself out with so little serious difficulty. In succeeding chapters the author presents a clear and orderly account of the transition from gaol to colony, the growth of a pastoral society, and the far-reaching changes resulting from the discovery of gold in Victoria and New South Wales. This last was perhaps the crucial event in the history of these communities; and to it Professor Crawford attributes much that is distinctive in the democracy that has since developed.

The later portions of the book are in effect a study of the nature and development of that distinctive type of democracy. It was closely related to current economic change, and its form and spirit were determined in large measure by the early emergence of organized labour as a political force. It is described as "aggressive democracy," but the record reveals less aggressiveness and more readiness to compromise than might have been expected. In one of his best chapters Professor Crawford analyses the Australian "bushman legend" and discusses its influence on the literature and art of the country. That legend, in his opinion, no longer represents the reality. What has emerged is in fact an urban industrial society, still influenced to some extent by the frontier spirit of the past, but differing from similar societies elsewhere mainly in its greater remoteness from the social and political traditions of older communities.

The book closes with a survey of present conditions and a cautious forecast of the future. The author expresses some doubt as to whether Australians can hope to maintain themselves by the present policy of excluding foreign products by prohibitive tariffs and barring would-be settlers by rigid immigration laws; but he ventures on no very searching criticism. This is the work of a historian who combines scholarship with unusual skill in exposition. It will be an invaluable aid to all students of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Burn's history of the West Indies is another useful addition to Hutchinson's University Library. It is an unusually well-written book, obviously the work of a scholar with a wide knowledge of the sources and of the secondary literature on the subject. It is unfortunate however that the author should have taken so little care in the arrangement of his material. The book is divided into seven chapters in chronological order, but without titles, and without any indication of their contents. Each of these is excellent in itself; but the effect is almost that of separate essays, dealing at once with the internal development of the islands and with British foreign and colonial policy over long, and not very definite periods of time.

The history of these islands, as Mr. Burn points out, has been determined less by the wishes and interests of their inhabitants than by the exigencies of British policy. "The initiative has always rested with Britain. The part played by the island communities in shaping their own history has been comparatively small."

In one aspect therefore this book is a study, at times a very illuminating study, of British colonial policy and of the conditions which determined it. The great desideratum was trade, and, in particular, the control of the slave trade. Mr. Burn's account of the struggle for this lucrative branch of commerce and of its effects on the international politics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is one of the best features of his book.

The later chapters present a somewhat depressing picture of social and political disintegration following the abolition of slavery. The real need, Mr. Burn observes, was "the creation of a new social order" and he concludes, with much evidence to support his view, that the island communities lacked both the material and the intellectual resources for such an undertaking. In his final section he examines the policies attempted during the present century, the recommendations of the Moyne Commission, and the effects of the "new deal" based on the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts. His forecast is not optimistic. He does not discount the possibility of a federation of the islands, to be followed by some form of dominion status; but he obviously has little faith in the elaborate plans of "social engineering" which appeal so strongly to such students as Professor Simey, and he anticipates no drastic change within a predictable future.

Mr. Wiseman is perhaps more sanguine. The historical survey is sketchy in the extreme; and it is clear that his interest lies mainly in the present conditions of the islands and in the plans being discussed for their social and political rehabilitation. His expressed aim is to deal with the entire group of islands; but there is a tendency, natural enough in the circumstances, to concentrate on such communities as Barbados and Jamaica.

The most useful portion of the book is the discussion of current problems. The author describes in some detail the conference at Molteno Bay in September, 1947, where all parties were agreed on the necessity of federation and dominion status for the whole region. That is no doubt the ideal solution, but there are serious obstacles. Mr. Wiseman points out that not a single island in the group possesses the economic stability needed for the effective working of responsible government; and the great disparity between the different islands places almost insuperable difficulties in the way of any plan that has yet been suggested. The need is still, as it was a century ago, the creation of a new social order; and that is a task which can be accomplished only by the people of the islands themselves. Their history does not greatly aid them, and the record as set down in these two books does not encourage the hope that it can be anything but a slow and laborious process.

Recent events in Egypt and the Soudan have made Mr. Theobald's study of the Mahdiya a timely publication. The book is in fact a history of the establishment of British power in the region. It is perhaps neither so original nor so important as the publishers suggest; but it is an interesting and well-documented account of one of the less well-known episodes in the history of nineteenth-century imperialism. The most interesting chapters are those which deal with the career and achievements of the Mahdi, a fanatic fired with a passion for the regeneration of Islam, and a soldier of more than ordinary ability. His death, shortly after the fall of Khartoum and the murder of Gordon, left little opportunity to test his qualities as a ruler. The later sections deal with the career of his successor, Khalifa Abd Allahi, a ruthless despot, but a shrewd

politician and a competent administrator. The book concludes with an account of Kitchener's reconquest of the country and his march to Fashoda to frustrate the designs of Captain Marchand. It will probably be of interest mainly to the specialist, but two conclusions emerge clearly: that Egyptian sovereignty over the Soudan was purely nominal even before the 1880's; and that without British intervention that sovereignty would almost certainly not have been restored.

While the Soudan was being brought under the joint control of Britain and Egypt, at the other end of Africa the first steps were being taken towards the annexation of the territory that was to become Southern Rhodesia. The two diaries published in *Gold and the Gospel in Mashonaland* provide some interesting evidence on the diverse motives which prompted this undertaking, and on the methods of Rhodes and his school of imperialists. The first is the record of a journey to the Zambesi made by Dr. Knight Bruce, Bishop of Kimberley, in the autumn of 1888, to investigate the possibilities of extending missionary enterprise in the region. The second is a day-to-day account of the negotiations conducted by three of Rhodes's agents with the Matabele chief Lobengula to secure exclusive mineral rights throughout his territories. It is hardly necessary to add that the second of these ventures was the more successful. The conclusions are epitomised in two statements by the Bishop and Rhodes. "It seems an immense land under an immense curse," said the bishop; "if this be the curse of Ham, then that was a very terrible curse indeed." "Our concession is gigantic," said Rhodes, complimenting Rudd on his achievement; "it is like giving a man the whole of Australia."

The diaries themselves are not remarkable, and they probably add little to what is known of English penetration into the region. The Bishop's diary contains less information about the country and its inhabitants than might have been expected. He travelled without white companions, and his serenity under difficult conditions contrasts strikingly with the impatience of Rudd and his colleagues, who were eager to seal the compact with Lobengula and get back to Kimberley. On the Zambesi Dr. Bruce encountered traces of Portuguese rule and of the work of Catholic missionaries. To these latter he pays a tribute for their courage and devotion, coupled with a lament that so much zeal should be expended on so unworthy a cause.

Rudd's diary is on the whole the more interesting for the account which it contains of life in Lobengula's kraal. He and his colleagues, Thompson and Maguire, were university men, the latter a fellow of All Souls, who had abandoned academic pursuits for the more lucrative fields of Kimberley and Johannesburg; but they seem to have adapted themselves without much difficulty to the unusual surroundings at Bulawayo. It was evident from the outset that Lobengula would sign. He did not relish the prospect; but the offer of rifles, ammunition, a steamboat on the Zambesi, and a regular if modest income, was too tempting to be resisted. He appears to have had a sense of humour and to have enjoyed keeping the Englishmen on tenterhooks as long as possible; and there is unconscious humour in Rudd's account of the delays and procrastination, as well as in his final comment that "it was all accomplished in an entirely constitutional way." The diaries are well edited, and the introductions by Miss Fripp and Mr. Hiller give an adequate account of conditions in South Africa and the surrounding region.

There is little in the abridged edition of Hume Brown's *History of Scotland* that calls for comment. This edition, the third since 1908, has been prepared by the Scottish Historiographer Royal for the use of senior students in Scottish schools. As an introduction to the subject it may be useful, and the large number of excellent photographs and illustrations will make it attractive to the general reader; but it bears little resemblance to the original work. Brevity has evidently been a major objective. The industrial revolution and its results are disposed of in three pages; and only three more are required to relate the history of Scotland through the nineteenth century and after. The agreeable feature is an entire absence of polemics and a degree of objectivity that is rare in histories of Scotland, especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Something may be learned from the book, despite the over-strained simplicity of the style; but if this is history cut to the requirements of the Scottish schoolboy, then the intellectual stature of that formidable individual would appear to be less daunting than the outer world has been led to believe.

Mr. Williams's *History of Modern Wales* is a more ambitious, and on the whole a more successful essay. An introductory chapter sketches the history of the Principality during the later middle ages. The bulk of the book deals with its development since the Reformation and the union with England in the reign of Henry VIII. It is in the main a social history. Wales has had little politics since the sixteenth century, and Welshmen have, with few exceptions, played no conspicuous part in the politics of Westminster. A few of them, including the founder of the Cecil family and the Welsh relatives of Thomas Cromwell, profited from the accession of the Tudors and the changes which they wrought. A larger number profited from the distribution of church lands and founded a class of petty gentry, who dominated the life of the country, despite the industrial changes of the past century, until the close of World War I.

This is the record of a people who have contrived to live a curiously withdrawn life. The forces that have changed that life have almost always, in Mr. Williams's opinion, come from England. They have often been powerful forces, but their effects have been worked out very slowly. That is true of the Reformation, of Puritanism, of industrialism, and even of Calvinistic Methodism, perhaps the most powerful force that has influenced the life of the Welsh people in recent centuries. One interesting comparison with the history of the people of French Canada is suggested by the results of a report on education in Wales, published in 1847. It was in effect a sweeping condemnation of the education, as well as of the morals and manners of the Welsh people; and its effect in arousing the national spirit of the Welsh was not unlike that produced in Lower Canada by Lord Durham's *Report*.

Political nationalism has, at least in modern times, exerted very little influence on the history either of Scotland or of Wales. In Ireland alone, among the non-English communities that have been incorporated into the United Kingdom, it has proven an intractable force. The reasons are evident in the history of these communities; and they appear clearly in the volumes on Ireland here considered. Mr. Strauss, whose study of the interactions of Irish nationalism and British democracy is one of the most challenging accounts of Anglo-Irish relations in the nineteenth century that has yet been published, describes Ireland as "England's first colony, . . . the first substantial object in the western world

of those forces which have been vaguely but suggestively described as imperialist." Mr. Beckett does not employ such terms. Like most conservative writers he places the emphasis on the element of defence in British policy. But his account of the conquest, the land confiscation—on which he says less than the importance of the subject would seem to warrant—and on the "Protestant Nation" of the eighteenth century, all point to the same conclusion.

On the Union and its sequel the two writers diverge. Mr. Beckett, while recognizing the incomplete character of Pitt's measure, tends to emphasize the element of union. Like Dicey and other opponents of the Home Rule movement, he evidently considers that the Act of 1801 did in fact create a nation. Mr. Strauss regards that Act as a mere legal and constitutional arrangement, which scarcely touched the basic realities of Anglo-Irish relationship. Ireland, in his judgment, remained, after the Union as before, a dependent colony, no less subject to the rule of the imperial power than at any earlier period in her history.

Beyond that point the two books can hardly be compared. Mr. Beckett's is a historical survey, and it is a tribute to his skill that he has managed to compress so much that is relevant in less than two hundred pages. He writes with unusual objectivity, although his point of view is evident throughout. His book is almost exclusively a political narrative, and he has less to say of economic and social conditions and of constitutional issues than the history would seem to require. Virtually no consideration is given to Grattan's Parliament as an experiment in self-government within the Empire; and most of the questions raised by the Union and the frustration of Pitt's larger designs are passed over without comment. The later portions of the history, the Home Rule movement, the rise of Sinn Fein, and the settlement of 1921, are related clearly and concisely; and nowhere is the author's freedom from party bias more evident.

The professed object is to write a history of the "Irish Nation"; but inevitably Mr. Beckett finds himself writing of the two nations which the events of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had created. The conquerors get the larger space; and the author ventures the opinion that there was nothing incongruous in this little privileged minority describing itself as the Irish nation during the eighteenth century. Nothing incongruous perhaps, since political power went with the possession of landed property; but it had little relation to the facts of Irish life; and a closer study of the manner in which the property was acquired, and of the mental attitude which prompted the description might have given Mr. Beckett's book greater value in explaining why the history of Ireland has differed so markedly from that of any other colony in which Englishmen have settled and made their homes.

Mr. Strauss's book is a more specialized study. Its purpose is twofold: to explain the history of the Irish nationalist movement in terms of the economic interests of the groups and individuals who at different times were prominent in it; and to analyse the effects of this movement on the political development of Britain during the nineteenth century. On neither ground is the argument wholly original; but it is usually interesting, often convincing, and always presented with clarity and vigour. That is especially true of the sections dealing with the influence of the Irish questions on the fortunes of the political parties in Britain, and with the part played by Irishmen in such developments as that of the trade union movement.

Mr. Strauss is severe in his judgments. Apart from the labour leaders of the present century, whose socialism, in his opinion, injected some needed vitality into the nationalist movement, there are few who escape his strictures. Grattan, O'Connell, Parnell, and the early leaders of the Sinn Fein party are regarded as bourgeois politicians, whose efforts were directed, not to securing the independence of their country, but to the advancement of the economic interests of their class. Pitt and those who aided him in effecting the Union are condemned at once as incompetent and as patently dishonest. The judgment is understandable, if not entirely just. The view that the Union became in effect a mere transfer of the landlord interest to the safer citadel of Westminster can hardly be disputed. But the assumption that it was so intended rests upon a very limited view of the evidence.

The history of Ireland under the Union is described as "a struggle between modern imperialism and colonial nationalism." On most of the critical phases in that struggle Mr. Strauss has a good deal to say that is illuminating. He makes extensive use of the printed sources; but the interpretation is at times a little strained. Bishop Doyle's professed loyalty to the British connection in 1825 is described as an attempt to ally the Catholic Church to the imperial power against the revolutionary masses. O'Connell's campaigns for Catholic Emancipation and for the repeal of the Union are considered as little more than a gigantic bluff to wring concessions from Britain in the interests of the middle class. His organization of the peasantry in the Catholic Association is attributed, not to political forethought, but to fear lest "the elemental force of the masses might sweep him and his respectable followers off their feet." Similarly, Parnell's alliance with the Land League is regarded as an attempt on his part to make use of the mass movement organized by Davitt to secure a constitutional change that would place the middle classes in power. A good deal of evidence is cited to illustrate Parnell's desire to erect a tariff to protect the interests of the commercial and industrial groups, as well as the opposition to such a change among English industrialists, led by Chamberlain. But Mr. Strauss does not notice, or at least he does not mention the fact that the bill of 1886 specifically excluded customs and excise duties from the jurisdiction of the Irish legislature.

These comments may create a misleading impression. This is an original and an extremely interesting book. It opens up certain aspects of Anglo-Irish history which merit more attention than they have received. But Irish nationalism since the days of Grattan and Flood has been a complex and many-sided movement. It has developed under conditions that have no exact parallel in any other part of the Empire. To reduce it to the terms of a class struggle is to present it in a partial and distorted form; and such a view does less than justice to many persons, in Great Britain and in Ireland, who have striven to find some solution for this most difficult of imperial problems.

These books contain a good many references to the extensive emigration which was a feature of Irish history during the nineteenth century. That subject, as it has affected the whole of the British Isles, is dealt with in some detail in Mr. Plant's volume, *Overseas Settlement*. The author was secretary of the Overseas Settlement Board from 1922 to 1937; and the most valuable portions of the book are those which deal with the records of migration during that period. But the book contains much interesting information on earlier plans

and proposals, such as those of Willmott Horton, Gibbon Wakefield, and others. The purpose of the book is practical. Redistribution of population is considered as an essential point in the over-all problem of the defence of the Commonwealth. But the difficulties are serious. Despite the efforts of the Board, emigration in the 1920's and 1930's fell far short of what was anticipated. It never approached the volume achieved in the decade before 1914, when peculiarly favourable conditions obtained in most of the dominions.

The Act under which the Overseas Settlement Board was established is about to expire; and Mr. Plant is here concerned to provide authentic data upon which a policy for the future may be based. His records, derived from a wide range of official and private sources, will no doubt be useful; but his conclusions are not very definite. The results of aided emigration, whether by government agencies or private associations, have not been impressive. The voluntary action of individuals has been immeasurably more important; and under present conditions it seems unlikely that there will be any marked change.

The recent history of emigration provides one example of co-operation between the governments of Great Britain and the dominions. This whole question of consultation and co-operation is dealt with in detail in Miss Harvey's handbook on the subject, which replaces an earlier publication of the kind prepared by Mr. Palmer in 1934. The material upon which the book is based was circulated among the delegates at the unofficial conference at Bigwin Inn in 1949; but it has been greatly expanded and it is now produced as a guide to the subject under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. For its purpose it is an admirable publication. Very little that has any bearing on the subject, from the early discussions on imperial federation to the most recent conferences of the prime ministers or of subordinate officials, has escaped the author's notice; and students of Commonwealth affairs will find it an invaluable work of reference.

An introductory chapter explains recent changes in the membership and character of the Commonwealth, in particular those changes that have resulted in the establishment of the Republic of India and the Dominions of Pakistan and Ceylon. The value of this and of subsequent chapters is enhanced by apt quotations from the speeches of Attlee, Churchill, Smuts, and other Commonwealth leaders. In the sections which follow Miss Harvey deals in turn with the machinery of consultation, with the special problem of defence, including present methods of co-operation for the control of atomic energy, and with the methods and policies of the Commonwealth and its individual members in international affairs. Much of the book is necessarily a catalogue of facts; but the material has been skilfully arranged, and within the space at her disposal Miss Harvey has assembled a surprising amount of information on the historic development and the present functioning of the various agencies through which the nations of the Commonwealth conduct their affairs.

The symposium on the history and working of parliamentary government in the Commonwealth might well be considered as a companion volume to Miss Harvey's work. It consists of twenty papers, which together provide an excellent survey of the way in which parliamentary institutions have been adapted to the needs of those communities which have attained to complete self-government within the Commonwealth. Included among these is an informative and well-written paper on plans for the federation of the West Indies, now under

discussion. In his foreword Professor Brady examines a number of the problems, mainly financial and administrative, with which governments in the dominions are now confronted, especially in the more advanced democracies. In addition to this foreword a few of the essays deal with subjects that are common to the governments of all the dominions. Sir Ernest Barker's paper on the ideals of the Commonwealth is a vigorous restatement of the faith of a Victorian liberal, based upon certain assumptions which some of his readers may find it difficult to accept. One of the most impressive chapters is that by Mr. H. V. Hodson on the position of the Crown and its part in the historic development of the Commonwealth.

Most of the papers deal with the forms and the functioning of parliamentary institutions in the several dominions. Of these Dr. Rajendra Prasad's account of the new constitution of India is outstanding. The corresponding paper on the constitution of Pakistan is less satisfactory, but the author was working under difficulties, since the constitution had not been completed at the time of writing. The papers on Canada and the Australasian dominions are well-written and informative surveys. That on parliamentary government in South Africa contains little that would justify its inclusion in this, or in any other volume. It is balanced however by an excellent paper on the non-European franchise in the Union by Mr. R. L. Thompson. One interesting point made by the author is that the British government is not wholly free from responsibility for the present situation, through its failure to insist on adequate guarantees for the rights of the natives in 1902. It may be so, but the assertion that "one cause of the war was the unsatisfactory treatment of the natives by the Boer Republics" is open to doubt.

This is the most serious problem affecting the life of any of the dominions at the present time. A more recent discussion of the question and of the present policy of the government of the Union will be found in the *Annual Register* for 1951. The article is in effect a powerful criticism of Mr. Malan's government and an appeal for a constructive social policy designed to relieve the very real and avoidable hardships to which the natives are subject. Other articles in this volume outline the course of events in each of the dominions during the year. All of them deal in large measure with the reaction of the several dominions to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. They are prefaced by an excellent survey of the Commonwealth as a whole by Nicholas Mansergh.

In his little volume on the constitution of Ceylon Sir Ivor Jennings writes with an authority that no one else can claim. During the conferences and negotiations which led to the establishment of dominion status in February, 1948, Sir Ivor acted as principal adviser to the late Mr. Senanayake and the State Council which drafted the constitution and worked out the arrangements for the transfer of power from the Colonial Office to the first fully responsible government in the island. The book contains, in addition to the text of the more important documents, an outline of the history of the negotiations and a full analysis of the provisions of the constitution. The interest and the value of this analysis are enhanced by illuminating comparisons with law and practice in other dominions; and it is written with the clarity and precision that are characteristic of all the author's work.

As far as possible practice under the new constitution is modelled on that of the British Parliament. Dominion status, delayed for some years by the

situation in India, but finally established by the Ceylon Independence Act in November, 1947, is defined within the terms of the Statute of Westminster. Defence and external relations are governed by agreements with Great Britain, the texts of which are here printed. The unanswered question relates to the character of political parties in the new dominion. The country has been free from the communal divisions that have delayed the advance to self-government in India; but up to the present there has been no very evident tendency towards the broad party division that has facilitated the development of stable government in the other dominions.

It is difficult in the space available to give an adequate impression of Mr. Campbell-Johnson's account of the work of Lord Mountbatten during the last months of British rule in India and the first troubled period, when the leaders of the new dominions were assuming the power and the responsibility which they had long demanded. The book is in many ways unique. The events which it records have no parallel in history. The purpose of the mission was the strangest ever undertaken by the representative of an imperial power. The methods employed by Mountbatten would have shocked almost every one of his predecessors in Delhi. And the result was a settlement that will be recorded as one of the truly great achievements in Britain's imperial history. Mr. Campbell-Johnson was a member of "the team" assembled by Lord Mountbatten when he accepted the assignment. He was in a position to observe at first hand the events which he records. As press attaché to the Viceroy he himself took an active, and by no means a negligible part in many of those events; and his narrative is certain to be one of the major sources upon which the future historian will have to depend.

It is plain from this account that the settlement—the peaceful transfer of power under conditions that might easily have led to irretrievable disaster, and the apparently real "reconciliation of ruler and ruled"—was due in the main to the personal influence of Lord Mountbatten. Throughout his diary the author emphasizes the effect of the Viceroy's "dynamic diplomacy by discussion"—a blend of firmness with easy informality and friendship, which inspired confidence, and forced decisions from men who were often reluctant to come to a decision. But it must be added that, without the statesmanship of the Indian leaders themselves, the outcome might have been very different. That is fully acknowledged; and if for nothing else, this book would be of the greatest interest for its intimate portraits of such men as Nehru, Patel, Jinnah, Rajagopalachari, and others, face to face with the greatest crisis in their country's history. Gandhi holds a special place, and the chapter recording his death and the reaction which followed is one of the most moving in the book.

The substance of the book consists of a day-to-day account of the work of Mountbatten and his assistants in connection with three major problems: the transfer of power with the minimum of disturbance to the new governments in Delhi and Karachi; the ending of paramountcy by means that would ensure the peaceful accession of the Indian rulers to one or other of the new dominions; and the gigantic problem created by partition, and the migration of millions of persons, most of them utterly destitute, from one region to another. The first of these was the most urgent. Mountbatten realized at once that the date fixed for withdrawal must be advanced, if disaster was to be averted. With some difficulty he convinced the British government; and in the months that

followed, he personally directed the division of the administrative system, the army, and other services. In nothing was his statesmanship revealed more clearly than in his dealings with the Indian princes; and it is a tribute to the confidence which he inspired that only two of the more important rulers had failed to make terms with the new order when the transfer took place.

One of the most impressive sections of his book is the description of the mass movement of peoples, following the partition of the Punjab. It created a social problem, and because of its proximity to Delhi, a political problem of alarming proportions. In dealing with it the part played by Lady Mountbatten and her daughter was hardly less important than that of the Viceroy himself. Their tireless labour for the relief of suffering touched the imagination of the Indian people as few things in the long history of British rule have done; and to this must be attributed no small part of the enthusiasm which marked the closing scenes in Delhi. "You may have many gifts and presents," said Mr. Nehru during the dinner which marked the close of Mountbatten's governor-generalship of the new dominion; "you can have nothing more real or more precious than the love of the people."

In his essay on the ideals of the Commonwealth Sir Ernest Barker observes that the germ of self-government in India is to be found in the Councils Act of 1861. That is perhaps a doubtful assumption. There is little in that measure or in the intentions of those who framed and worked it to indicate development towards responsible government and dominion status. The apt phrase "fulfillment of British rule in India" may obscure more than it reveals. What is certain is that but for the statesmanship here recorded the outcome might have been very different. Many considerations have influenced the decision of India and Pakistan to remain within the Commonwealth. Nothing can have contributed more powerfully to that result than the manner in which this great operation was conducted, and the friendship and confidence inspired by Lord and Lady Mountbatten and the remarkable group of men who aided them. The Commonwealth has been fortunate in having such a statesman available; and the last of the viceroys is fortunate in the chronicler who has related his achievements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAILEY, SYDNEY D., ed. *Parliamentary Government in the Commonwealth*. Foreword by Commander STEPHEN KING-HALL; Introduction by Professor ALEXANDER BRADY. London: Hansard Society. 1951. Pp. vi, 217. 9s.

BECKETT, J. A. *A Short History of Ireland*. London: Hutchinson's University Library [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1952. Pp. viii, 208. \$2.25.

BROCK, W. R. *Britain and the Dominions*. British Commonwealth Series, I. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1951. Pp. xxii, 522. \$2.50.

BROWN, P. HUME. *A Short History of Scotland*. New edition by HENRY W. MEIKLE. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd. [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co.]. 1951. Pp. xvi, 350. \$3.75.

BURN, W. L. *The British West Indies*. London: Hutchinson's University Library [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1951. Pp. 196. \$2.00.

CAMPBELL-JOHNSON, ALAN. *Mission with Mountbatten*. London: Robert Hale Limited [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1951. Pp. 383. \$6.00.

CARRINGTON, C. E. *John Robert Godley of Canterbury*. London: Cambridge Uni-

versity Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1950. Pp. xvi, 251. \$5.75.

CRAWFORD, R. M. *Australia*. London: Hutchinson's University Library [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1952. Pp. 203. \$2.25.

FRIPP, CONSTANCE E. and HILLER, V. E., eds. *Gold and the Gospel in Mashonaland, 1888, Being the Journals of 1. The Mashonaland Mission of Bishop Knight-Bruce; 2. The Concession Journey of Charles Dunell Rudd*. Central African Archives, Oppenheimer Series, 4. London: Chatto & Windus [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co.]. 1949. Pp. x, 246. \$6.00.

HARVEY, HEATHER J. *Consultation and Co-operation in the Commonwealth: A Handbook on Methods and Practice*. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. viii, 411. \$6.50.

JENNINGS, Sir IVOR. *The Constitution of Ceylon*. Second edition. London, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 285. \$4.00.

MACADAM, IVISON S., ed. *The Annual Register: A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad for the Year 1950*. Assisted by HUGH LATIMER. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co. 1951. Pp. xx, 521. \$10.00.

PLANT, G. F. *Overseas Settlement: Migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions*. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. vi, 186. \$3.75.

SCHLESINGER, ERIC. *Irish Nationalism and British Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1951. Pp. xii, 307. \$5.25.

THEOBALD, A. B. *The Mahdiya: A History of the Soudan, 1881 to 1899*. London, Toronto: Longmans Green. 1951. Pp. x, 273. \$5.00.

WILLIAMS, DAVID. *A History of Modern Wales*. London: John Murray [Toronto: Musson Book Company Ltd.]. 1950. Pp. 308. \$2.75.

WISEMAN, H. A. *A Short History of the British West Indies*. London: University of London Press [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co.]. 1950. Pp. 159. \$1.75.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Canada and the United States: Some Aspects of Their Historical Relations.

By HUGH LL. KEENLEYSIDE. Revised and enlarged edition by HUGH LL. KEENLEYSIDE and GERALD S. BROWN; Introduction by W. P. M. KENNEDY. New York: Alfred A. Knopf [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1952. Pp. xxvi, 406, xii. \$6.50.

THIS is a new edition of a pioneer work published in 1929. It is interesting to compare the two editions; the comparison serves in some degree as an indication of what has happened to "scholarly publication" during the past quarter-century. The original edition (which incidentally cost just half as much as the new one) was produced in a rather blue bookish format, with vast numbers of footnotes and references. The new one has been dressed up in more attractive type and binding. A good deal of the original rather inflated *apparatus criticus* could have been spared; but instead of reducing it, the new edition has simply swept it all away. Six useful maps have also been eliminated, and the reader must find his way through the intricacies of the boundary disputes without their aid. The "selected bibliography" is limited to books and articles published since 1940, on the ground apparently that earlier works are listed in other books. In general one gets the impression that an attempt has been made to appeal to a more "popular" audience.

An extraordinary amount has happened in Canadian-American relations since 1929. The new edition deals with this crowded quarter-century by adding a new final chapter, and by some modifications in other chapters; the general form of the first edition, too topical and not sufficiently chronological in this reviewer's opinion, is retained. The new chapter ("The Second World War and After") is good as far as it goes, but is too terse to go very far. It is suggestive rather than informative. It quotes at length Mr. Pearson's widely discussed speech of 1951 ("the days of relatively easy and automatic political relations . . . are . . . over") but makes almost no reference to any specific points of difficulty or controversy. The St. Lawrence seaway failure is barely mentioned. There is no mention of confederation with Newfoundland or of the U.S. bases there. As for the earlier chapters, they have been less completely revised in the light of new research than one might have expected. The revision does not seem to have gone farther than the addition or modification of a paragraph here and there on the basis of an important book; comparatively little appears to have been done with the periodical literature. Even some of the errors and omissions noted by reviewers of the first edition are repeated here; Simcoe is still "Sir John," although A. H. U. Colquhoun pointed out this slip in his notice in the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW in 1929. An article listed in the bibliography is said to put "the Rush-Bagot Treaty [sic] in a new light"; but this agreement of 1817 is not mentioned in the text in any light at all except for a passing reference to its threatened abrogation in 1864. This rather important omission was pointed out by J. M. Callahan when he reviewed the first edition in the *American Historical Review*.

The virtues of this book are those of the original edition, notably vigour and impartiality. The serious student of Canadian-American relations will want to

keep that original edition beside him. He is likely to find the revised version a trifle disappointing. As for the Canadian general reader, he will probably not be attracted to the book by the publisher's description on the dust-cover: "The story of our relations with Canada from colonial times to the present."

C. P. STACEY

Army Headquarters, Ottawa

Les Voyages de Samuel Champlain, saintongeais, père du Canada. Introduction, choix de textes et notes par HUBERT DESCHAMPS. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France [Montréal: Librairie Ducharme]. 1951. Pp. iv, 368. \$4.50.

Etude sur les écrits de saint Jean de Brébeuf, I. Par RENÉ LATOURELLE. Préface de M. Guy FRÉGUAULT. Studii Collegii Maximi Immaculatae Conceptionis, IX. Montréal: Les Editions de l'Immaculée-Conception. 1952. Pp. xx, 218. \$3.00.

Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 16. Montréal: Les Dix. 1951. Pp. 283.

ONE of the impressive features of the early history of Canada is the fact that so many of those who played a major role in making that history were not only literate but were also close observers of the contemporary scene. Two of these makers of early Canada to whose writings we owe so much are the subject of two of the volumes under review, Samuel Champlain and Saint Jean de Brébeuf.

The first book, *Les Voyages de Samuel Champlain*, is one of a series, "Colonies et Empires," published by the Presses Universitaires de France under the direction of Ch.-André Julien. It contains a selection of texts from the works of Champlain with an introduction and explanatory notes, five simple sketch maps, and an index. It is the introduction which will attract attention on the part of historians; for the selected texts and notes, useful as they may be, add nothing to what is already available in more complete detail in Laverdière and Biggar. M. Deschamps's introduction is interesting and enlightening. He gives the essential facts about Champlain and his birthplace, about New France prior to Champlain's arrival, and about Champlain's explorations in North America. None of this is new or original, but what is of interest is his obvious sympathy and affection for his hero. Here is a man who stands above the ordinary level of mankind, who possesses gifts rarely found in one individual. Here is the complete explorer who embodies the qualities of the soldier, the sailor, the geographer, the ethnologist, and the diplomatist; here is the man of action who is much more than a man of action; here is the prophet of a new cause who compelled France to think about and to support Canada; here is the founder of a colony who, more than any other, deserves the title so often bestowed upon him, the Father of Canada. The great virtue of this enthusiasm is that it may lead some who have never of their own accord dipped into Champlain's *Voyages* to read Champlain's own texts with interest and understanding.

Like M. Deschamps's book, Fr. Latourelle's study of Brébeuf is not a formal biography but a study of texts. Fr. Latourelle does not, however, like Deschamps, rely upon large gobbets of text embellished with a few explanatory footnotes; he selects, edits, and annotates his texts in great detail. His work was originally prepared as a doctorate thesis; but let it not be said that the author therefore confounds us with the apparatus of erudition. On the contrary, he gives us a readable as well as a thoroughly scientific book.

Since Fr. Latourelle plans to publish his comments in two volumes, this first volume deals with only a few of Brébeuf's writings. It contains, in addition to an introduction explaining the general tenor of the work, an inventory of Brébeuf's known writings, a discussion of their authenticity, and a detailed study of Brébeuf as a traveller, as an ethnologist, and as the founder of a mission as seen in the pages of the *Relations* of 1635 and 1636. In these two *Relations* we get a deep insight into the lives of the Indians—for no one has given us more useful evidence about the habits and customs of the Hurons—and into the character of Brébeuf himself. It is quite fair to say, as Professor Frégault has written in the preface, "Henceforth it will be impossible to study Brébeuf, the period of the martyrs, the culture of the Hurons, and the religious history of New France without having recourse to Fr. Latourelle's work." Incidentally, the book contains an excellent bibliography and a table of contents, but no index. Presumably this will follow in the second volume.

English-speaking Canada does not seem to have anything to compare with *Les Dix*, a group of ten scholars meeting together to read and discuss papers of historical interest and then to publish the results of their researches. As may be expected the papers are highly specialized and are uneven in quality; but over the past sixteen years *Les Dix* have made a notable contribution to the study of Canadian history. The sixteenth volume of *Les Cahiers* is well up to the standard of previous volumes. The death of Aegidius Fauteux ten years ago is commemorated by the publication for the first time of an article which he read before the Public Library Association in 1933 on "Les Débuts de l'imprimerie au Canada." Jacques Rousseau, who has filled the vacancy among *Les Dix* left by the death of Aristide Beaugrand-Champagne, in an excellent article on "Samuel de Champlain, botaniste mexicain et antillais" discusses Champlain's alleged voyages to the Antilles and Mexico in 1599 and 1601 and the botanical notes which appear in the published account of his journeys. Jean Bruchési reveals something of the human side of Papineau in "Lettres d'un exilé (1837-39)." This article studies thirty-two of Papineau's letters to his wife written between 1837-9. The letters are part of the collection of Papineau's correspondence given to the Quebec Archives by Mademoiselle Augustine Bourassa, granddaughter of the Patriote chief. Léo-Paul Desrosiers dips into the pages of the *Quebec Herald* to find something of the reaction of Quebec towards the Constitutional Act; Mgr Maurault writes interestingly of his trip to Richelieu, the town built to the orders of the great Cardinal; and Mgr Tessier gives a biographical sketch of the Abbé Dumoulin, one of the first missionaries to Red River. In an article entitled "Trois Seigneuries sans seigneurs" Raymond Douville presents a study of the colonization of the seigneuries of Lotbinière, Deschaillons, and Saint-Pierre-les-Becquets whose seigneurs were absentee landlords. P. G. Roy continues his work on the Robineau family; Gérard Malchelosse leafs through the early documents to follow the career of Daniel Greysolon, Sieur Du Lhut, in an article "Un Gentilhomme coureur de bois" and corrects a number of mis-statements which have appeared in earlier accounts; and Victor Morin continues his amusing series on "Clubs et sociétés notoires d'autrefois." May *Les Dix* continue to prosper and to produce their annual *Cahier*.

GEORGE F. G. STANLEY

The Royal Military College of Canada

The Peace of Paris, 1763. By ZENAB ESMAT RASHED. With a Foreword by MARK A. THOMSON. Liverpool: At the University Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 270. 15s.

In this volume Dr. Rashed, Lecturer on Modern History at the Ibrahim Pasha University in Cairo, makes the first attempt to write a detailed history of the making of the Peace of Paris, and Professor Mark A. Thomson of Liverpool who contributes the Foreword does well to emphasize this fact. The very considerable body of historical literature that has accumulated around this Peace is largely devoted to specific or isolated phases. Basil Williams and Ruville wrote biographies of Pitt, Richard Pares wrote on the West Indies, Vera Brown, Aiton, and Chistelow on Spain, and the French scholar, Waddington, who intended to write a detailed history did not live to complete the task. Though heavily indebted to the work of these predecessors, Dr. Rashed has produced an independent study, which exhibits the earmarks of a conscientious and professional craftsmanship, based on a broad documentation that leaves little to be desired. After an introductory chapter on war aims which is, perhaps, the least adequate section of the entire book, there follow chapters on the early discussions at the Hague, the Stanley-Bussy negotiations of 1761 which broke down over Pitt's obduracy on the fisheries issue, the resumption of the negotiations after Pitt's fall from power through the two Sardinian ambassadors Viry and Solar, and the final discussions between Bedford and Choiseul in Paris. A concluding chapter provides a searching and critical assessment of the entire treaty. Finally, one useful appendix reproduces a definitive text of the treaty itself and another the crucial instructions of January, 1761, issued by Charles III to Crimaldi, the Spanish ambassador in Paris, here printed for the first time.

Dr. Rashed is at her best on the negotiations of 1761 where she deals with Pitt, the Duke of Choiseul, and the Bourbon Family Compact which have always constituted the most controversial episode of the entire story. Like most of her predecessors she attributes the principal cause for the failure of these negotiations to Pitt's hectoring tone and intransigence on the Newfoundland fisheries, but unlike Waddington and Yorke, she denies that Pitt alone was responsible. She contends that a fair share of the responsibility for this failure must be laid at the door of the Duke of Choiseul whose precipitous haste in concluding the Family Compact with Spain prevented him from accepting the British peace terms when, after Pitt's departure, the British cabinet was disposed to grant the substance of his demands. Plausibly enough and unlike Basil Williams, Dr. Rashed challenges the validity of Pitt's notion that by denying the fisheries to the French he was really striking an effective blow against French naval reconstruction, a matter on which Choiseul was bent in any case. The new evidence and close logic which Dr. Rashed brings to the discussion of this episode cannot henceforth be ignored. It is all the more surprising, therefore, to learn that she finds it necessary to revive the old myth of Fox's purges and bribery in order to explain the acquiescence of Parliament in this treaty settlement which, after all, secured the original objects of the war and satisfied all reasonable Englishmen except those who lived by war or war-mongering.

WALTER L. DORN

Ohio State University

Arms and the Men. By IAN HAY. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1950. Pp. viii, 330. \$2.40.

The Campaign in Italy. By ERIC LINKLATER. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1951. Pp. x, 480. \$2.85.

Norway, The Commandos, Dieppe. By CHRISTOPHER BUCKLEY. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1951. Pp. viii, 276. \$2.40.

THESE books, available in Canada from the United Kingdom Information Office, Ottawa, are the first to appear of an eight-volume "popular military history," bearing the general title "The Second World War, 1939-1945," which is being written by various authors commissioned by the Government of the United Kingdom. Each writer has had access to official source material, and the series is intended to provide the general reader with a short authentic record pending publication of the official histories. The volumes are not documented.

In describing the part played by the British Army in the war Ian Hay has devoted most of his attention, he tells us, to what he calls the "internal history" of the tremendous operations involved. Thus he devotes his first six chapters to the growth of the Army from the New Model of Oliver Cromwell to the time of the invasion of Poland, and later interposes between his accounts of operations a survey of the Army's rapid expansion during the early years of the war and an examination of its organization, administration, and methods of training. Less than half the book deals with actual fighting, which is left for detailed treatment in the seven volumes to follow in the series. (The titles of these cover all the campaigns in which British troops participated except the operations of the British Expeditionary Force in 1939-40. Presumably the brief account of that period given in this introductory volume will not be enlarged upon.)

Ian Hay writes authoritatively on army reform, but in describing British operations he appears at times to have strayed far from his official sources. One or two examples from his account of the Italian campaign: Sicily was invaded thirty days, not two months, after the reduction of Pantelleria; the Germans lost an estimated 5,000 killed in Sicily, not 20,000; the Eighth Army's initial landings on the Italian mainland were made in the toe, not the heel, of the peninsula. The omission of all reference to General Montgomery's hard fighting on the Adriatic coast late in 1943 is strange, although not as strange as the impression left by the author that the Italian campaign ended with the capture of Rome.

The book is illustrated with some excellent photographs of British troops serving on various fronts. The Index is very sketchy.

Eric Linklater, given a more straightforward task than either of the other authors whose book is under review, has within the limitations of space imposed upon him written a well-balanced and accurate account of the campaign which began with the reduction of Pantelleria in June, 1943 and ended twenty-three months later with the occupation of Trieste and the surrender of the German armies in Italy. Setting the campaign against the background of the general strategy of the war, he shows how the Italian undertaking was always secondary to the invasion of northwest Europe. General Alexander's principal task was to wear down the forces of Kesselring and von Vietinghoff, and keep

them from reinforcing the eastern or western fronts from Italy. Accordingly, even while suffering reductions of his own resources to benefit the Allied offensive in the West, he maintained continual pressure up the long peninsula, whose barriers of mountain and river and sodden plain gave the defender every advantage.

Mr. Linklater writes in greater detail than might be expected in a single-volume account of a major campaign in which two whole army groups opposed each other for nearly two years. The general reader may well find the numerous accounts of fighting written at the brigade or battalion level somewhat repetitious and at times confusing—more than 170 individual Commonwealth units (as well as those of Allied forces) are identified in action, some as many as a dozen times. He will be grateful for the 51 regional maps, to which he must turn constantly in order to follow the campaign intelligently. But thanks to Mr. Linklater's literary skill these crowded pages have been fashioned into a smoothly flowing and highly readable narrative.

In general the contribution made by Canadian troops receives as much attention as the scope of the book allows (fourteen of the fifteen Canadian infantry battalions which fought in Italy are individually introduced). The enemy picture, however, is inadequately dealt with; one looks in vain for evidence that the author has made much use of the wealth of captured German military records becoming available in recent years.

Christopher Buckley's volume describes the smaller campaigns and actions in which Allied forces clashed with the enemy at various points along the west coast of Europe and in the Mediterranean during the first three years of the war. More than half the book deals with the ill-fated venture into Norway in the spring of 1940. The Allies, feeling morally obligated to come to the defence of Norway against the German aggression, were ill prepared for such an undertaking, as was shown not only by the shortage of trained men and equipment, but by the unfortunate "insufficiently close" liaison in the command at the higher levels. "It is difficult," writes Mr. Buckley, "in following the repeated changes of the Allied plan, not to be left with the impression that there was scarcely anyone who visualized the whole picture or possessed a clear conception of practical objectives." The otherwise depressing picture was brightened by the two brilliant sea battles of Narvik and the gallant fighting withdrawal of the troops under the skilful leadership of the local commanders, which resulted in an evacuation with smaller losses than might have been expected. The author has missed one point of Canadian interest. A Canadian force of 1300 left Aldershot to lead the frontal attack on Trondhjem, and got as far as Dunfermline before changing plans cancelled the assault.

Mr. Buckley's expertise in military reporting is revealed in his stimulating descriptions of the exploits by Commandos and other shock troops, which extended geographically from southern Italy to Spitsbergen, and ranged in scale from the early "pinprick raids" involving a landing by perhaps a dozen men to the brilliantly conceived and executed St. Nazaire operation. These are thrilling tales of adventure, even though, as the author points out, there was often a "remarkable contrast between the intensity of the training and preparation and the comparative insignificance of the objective."

Before his untimely death in Korea Christopher Buckley had revised the first proofs of his book in the light of criticisms received from those well qual-

fied to comment with authority. His account of the Dieppe raid may in general therefore be accepted as factually sound. It adds no new material to that published by the Official Historian of the Canadian Army. Today, ten years after that operation, whose value was so widely questioned at the time, Canadian readers will welcome Mr. Buckley's recognition of the importance of the lessons which Dieppe taught the planners of the invasion of Normandy.

G. W. L. NICHOLSON

Ottawa

A History of the League of Nations, I, II. By F. P. WALTERS. Published under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xvi, 1-464; viii, 465-833. \$10.50.

AFTER I had finished reading Mr. Walter's admirable history of the League of Nations I took down from the shelves the official *Ten Years of World Co-operation* which was published by the League Secretariat in 1930 and which almost exactly parallels the author's first volume. The contrast between its carefully correct description of the League's work with such prim observations as ". . . there is no doubt that the League's development has been hampered and retarded by the absence of the United States," and Mr. Walters' equally accurate but frank and revealing analysis of how the League was treated by the diplomats and statesmen of the Great Powers is a salutary illustration of the limitations of official surveys. It also makes all the more impressive Mr. Walters' achievement. This volume must surely be unique in containing the history of the greatest international experiment of our time from the pen of one who shared its fortunes from start to finish, and who has brilliantly combined the senior official's knowledge of events from the inside with the historian's sense of responsibility to his craft.

Mr. Walters organized his history into five parts: The Making of the League; The Years of Growth (1920-1923); The Years of Stability (1923-1931); The Years of Conflict (1931-1936); and The Years of Defeat (1936-1946). As an unphilosophical historian he hurriedly traverses the first part and then gets thankfully into his stride in describing the growth, decline, and death of the institution he served so loyally first as personal assistant to the Secretary-General and eventually as the senior United Kingdom official. The author has the knack of clarifying such involved problems as the League's handling of minorities' grievances and the debates in the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament and of relating them to the contemporary scene, and this makes his survey much more than a history of League institutions and policies. His style is lucid but not dramatic. Even the sorriest moments in the League's misfortunes do not evoke in his prose that *saeva indignatio* which the author has undoubtedly felt. Such restraint makes all the more impressive his verdict upon the behaviour of the Great Powers whose diplomats at best, as in Britain, "continued to treat the work of the League as having no essential connection with the practical business of their profession." In Geneva as in Lake Success it was the Great Powers who made or marred international co-operation. Small ones, even Switzerland, might retard progress by their touchiness, their pettiness, and their faithlessness to their vows, as Mr. Walters has demonstrated.

But, as Greece discovered, they could be put in their place when the Great Powers gave the League the necessary leadership. When the Great Powers betrayed the League by sins of omission or commission—and the record is here for all who wish to read—they eventually plunged themselves and the world into doom. It says much for Mr. Walters' impartiality that he is as forthright in his criticisms of British statesmen as of any others. In the early years, a foreign policy based on the Covenant, writes the author, "had no charms for the sentimental adventurousness of Lloyd George or the old-fashioned imperialism of Curzon." British foreign secretaries might use the Locarno group of states, as Sir Austen Chamberlain did, to limit League policies, or by their behaviour in Geneva, as in Sir John Simon's time, they might ". . . become a source of discouragement or weakness." In contrast to such as these, Balfour, Henderson, Eden, and especially Cecil receive due commendation. Among European statesmen, Nansen, Benes, Briand, and Litvinoff emerge with the most credit. The most efficient chairman in League history was Bruce of Australia.

Canadians have little reason to be proud of their country's record at Geneva. Mr. Walters has treated it with fairness and proportion. He has praise for Borden's sagacity, and understanding of the Canadian view of Article Ten. Without malice, he notes of a speech on Canadian policy in 1924 by Senator Dandurand that ". . . like many Canadian spokesmen before and since he described with pride the total demilitarization of her southern frontier from the Atlantic to the Pacific." He passes quickly over the Riddell episode in 1935. The worst speech made by any Canadian in Geneva, that of Cahan in 1932, is wrongly ascribed, however, to him as the Canadian Minister for External Affairs, which fortunately he never was. It is significant that Mr. Walters fastens upon the change in Canada's attitude during the Second World War, from exerting its influence ". . . regularly on the side of cutting down the obligations of the Covenant" to undertaking to play a full part in ensuring preponderant power to protect peace, as symptomatic of the new spirit among the English-speaking countries. One can only hope faintly that another Walters will not be called upon to write a parallel history of the United Nations in the years that lie ahead.

F. H. SOWARD

The University of British Columbia

The Establishment of Canadian Diplomatic Status at Washington. By JOHN S. GALBRAITH. University of California Publications in History, D. K. BJORK, R. H. FISHER, and THEODORE SALOUTOS, Editors: XLI. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1951. Pp. xii, 119. \$1.65.

THIS monograph describes, with scholarly competence, the background of the establishment of Canada's first diplomatic mission in Washington, and the assertion of the right of legation. This achievement of diplomatic status is explained as a final, unforeseen result of the nineteenth and early twentieth century efforts of Canadian governments to secure full commercial autonomy, and of the successive demands for independent representation of Canadian interests in the League and in foreign capitals, in particular in Washington. To this background, four-fifths of the book is devoted.

In so doing, the author follows a well-beaten path, and adopts a familiar explanation of the evolution of Canadian diplomatic status. The importance of the United States as a force in this development is particularly stressed. Although no significantly new material is offered, the author's study of the archives has produced some additional evidence concerning the attitudes, already known, of political personages such as Macdonald, Galt, Tupper and Laurier towards the diplomatic representation of Canada's interests. Only two of the five chapters are devoted directly to the establishment of the Washington mission. This ground has been fully covered elsewhere, and no archives have yet been opened to reveal new material concerning Borden, King, and Bennett in this matter. In particular, no new evidence is given concerning the six-year delay in the actual setting up of the Washington legation after its original announcement. The author ascribes this delay largely to the opposition of some of the other dominions, and not to Great Britain. There is, curiously, no mention of the Imperial Conference of 1926, and the new formulation of Commonwealth relations, as a contributing factor in the final decision to appoint the first Minister.

Although many of the forerunners of the first Canadian diplomatic establishment, such as the London High Commissionership, the Paris Agency-General, the Canadian War Mission in Washington, and the International Joint Commission, are briefly discussed, there is no mention of other semi-diplomatic predecessors, such as the immigration agents, the trade commissioners, or the permanent delegate to the League of Nations, nor of the almost simultaneous election of Canada to the League Council. Nor is there any analysis of the actual functioning of the offices of Canadian representation, as living political institutions serving a multitude of Canadian interests. As a result, this work, although based on wide study of materials available, takes a somewhat old-fashioned or, at least, traditional approach to the problem of Canadian diplomacy.

H. GORDON SKILLING

Dartmouth College
Hanover, N.H.

Beatty of the C.P.R.: A Biography. By D. H. MILLER-BARSTOW. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited. 1951. Pp. viii, 187. \$5.50.

F. W. BEATTY joined the Law Department of the Canadian Pacific Railway a year after he was called to the Bar. He became general solicitor, general counsel, vice-president, and, in 1918, president. Like his predecessors in that high office, Sir Edward Beatty occupied one of the great positions in Canadian business, both as president of the transportation system and as director of a number of other companies. He guided the destinies of the railway through the booming years of the twenties, the gloom of the depression, and, finally, the early part of World War II. He retired, on grounds of ill health, a year before his death in 1943.

Mr. Miller-Barstow gives an interesting and not uncritical account of Sir Edward Beatty's career. On the whole he follows the theme of "a great Canadian—great man," and limitations appear almost unexpectedly and without any consistent effect on the story as a whole. He portrays Beatty as essentially concerned with the railway in whose service he spent his life, and shows clearly

the views which Beatty advanced. One might wish that the story of the railway was placed more in its setting: the explanations of the appearance, role, and problems of the Canadian National Railway are all too brief, as is the background of the C.P.R. itself. More backward looks might have shown the author that "the railway problem," however new it might seem to each generation, had an interesting ancestry and some regular pattern. There was a time when the C.P.R. was regarded by the older Grand Trunk Railway as living on the public budget and thus indulging in unfair competition. Later the roles were apparently reversed. By the end of World War I the country had inherited some railways which could no longer maintain themselves. Were they then to be allowed to rot? Should they, alternatively, be joined to the C.P.R.? When the depression of 1929 hit all railways, as it did other business, the old phrases about the great future of Canada were forgotten, and the C.P.R. led the movement for curtailment of lines and costs. It is a question whether such a policy would have served the country after 1939.

The author looks at Sir Edward Beatty's conception of a great business leader: "Beatty's preference for the 'Fuehrer-prinzip' in business," "his conception of the Messianic role of the corporation." Beatty appears as a hard-working, devoted servant of the company in which he spent his adult life; as a partisan of some vigour in respect of the company's interests; as a man with a generally conservative view of business and society; and as active in some outside affairs, such as McGill University. As a character-study the book is suggestive but uneven. As an examination of the railway question with which Beatty was connected it does more to indicate his approach than to analyse either the man's views or their validity.

G. DE T. GLAZEBROOK

Ottawa

The Canadian Grain Trade 1931-51. By D. A. MACGIBBON. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. x, 227. \$4.50.

FEW problems have so constantly occupied the attention of governments in Canada as those arising out of the marketing and production of grain. Their study, as Dr. MacGibbon makes very clear, lies properly in the realm of political economy and not uncommonly the political aspect has pushed the economic well into the background. This is apparent in the author's discussion of such controversial issues as government monopoly of marketing, freedom *versus* control in marketing and production, competition between independent companies and producer-controlled organizations. The skill with which he deals with these and other questions reflects long study and wide experience in the trade. The volume is a fitting sequel to the *Canadian Grain Trade* (1932) and must be regarded as easily the most comprehensive and authoritative account of its subject.

Until the close of the 1930's, governmental measures taken to relieve agricultural depression on the prairies were based on the general belief that the high quality of Canadian grain was a guarantee of a satisfactory level of effective world demand and that, while periods of depression might occasion temporary assistance to the industry, no fundamental changes in marketing and production techniques were called for. The gradual abandonment of this belief is one of the major themes of the book. Recognition of the fact that agricultural

instability and depression were the outcome of world trade disequilibrium led to fundamental changes in agricultural policy. The Wheat Board, formed in the mid-thirties to meet a single emergency, was established as a permanent organization and may be looked on as a working compromise between demands which ranged from the setting up of government monopoly of marketing to the restoration of complete freedom in marketing operations. When it became apparent that preoccupation with marketing techniques and policies could produce only partial solutions, more direct measures were taken to attain a better balance between domestic production and prospective world demand. The wheat acreage reduction programme of the early forties represented a long step in this direction and one which, along with Prairie Farm Assistance and payments to augment farm incomes in crop failure areas, quickened the process by which wheat growing was brought into the category of a government-aided industry. Wartime developments increased the amount of government support and intervention although greater stability of income for the farm was accompanied by controls which were to bear down more heavily on the price of wheat than on that of any other commodity.

In his discussion of developments in the war and post-war years, Dr. MacGibbon's account of the Wheat Board's operations over this period suggests one conclusion difficult to dispute, namely, that whatever economic advantages the Board might have brought the farmer, politically it was a necessity if peace was to be achieved on the prairie farm front. Other useful and informative sections on this period deal with the International Wheat Agreement of 1949, the growth of Pool organizations in recent years, the activities and philosophy of the United Grain Growers Limited, and the position of the independent grain companies and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Finally, the difficult and controversial question of taxation of co-operative profits and the even more emotionally charged British Wheat Agreement are treated with balance and objectivity.

Although Dr. MacGibbon's avoidance of personalities makes his book a less colourful document than it would otherwise be, he leaves no doubts about his views and preferences in the issues with which he deals—open markets where possible, otherwise a workable minimum of control and regulation. And where world market conditions call for measures to preserve agricultural stability, these must be taken with an awareness of the dangers present in administrative controls and in particular the great likelihood that the long-run effects of policies will be neglected under the pressure of interests primarily or exclusively concerned with the present. Because of its statement of issues such as these and its wealth of informative detail students of Canadian affairs will be grateful for this volume. It lacks a bibliography but contains an adequate index.

W. T. EASTERBROOK

The University of Toronto

People of the Deer. By FARLEY MOWAT. With drawings by SAMUEL BRYANT. An Atlantic Monthly Press Book. Boston: Little, Brown and Company [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1952. Pp. viii, 344. \$4.50.

A very long review would be needed to point out all the errors and misleading statements in this well-written and plausible book, and to document them

with references, so the present review will have to be confined to a discussion of the main points the author tries to make, in his charges against white men in the Canadian Arctic. Briefly, his book is an account of his trip to the Nueletin Lake-Kazan River country northwest of Churchill in the summers of 1947 and 1948, during which he learned about the supposed decimation—and the causes thereof—of a band of Caribou Eskimos he calls the Ihalmuit.

Starvation, he says, was the chief cause of this decimation, and the traders were mainly responsible for it because they persuaded the Eskimos (*a*) to forsake their traditional weapons in favour of the rifle, which is useless when ammunition is no longer available; and (*b*) to abandon the seasonal caribou hunts in favour of trapping the white fox.

Mr. Mowat, however, during his travels, must have noted that the most effective way of slaughtering the caribou is still the traditional one of spearing them at the river crossings (as he describes on pages 132, 135-6, and 167-8), and that therefore the rifle is really a second-choice weapon in procuring a large supply of caribou meat; and being a zoologist he should know that, as the pelt of the Arctic fox is white only in the winter, and as the caribou hunts take place in the spring and fall, the trapping does not interfere with the hunting.

But perhaps the weakest point in the whole book is that his tale of the starvation of the "Ihalmuit" is based on accounts given to him by a couple of Eskimos who spoke no English. Mr. Mowat tries to persuade us that he understood what they were saying to him. But since it takes years of contact with the Eskimos to understand their simplest phrases, and since he spent only 47 days in the Barrens, his long and involved tale of their misfortunes during the past half-century can hardly be accurate.

The author's "statistics" of their population, given on page 260, on which his claims of decimation are largely based, are vague, to say the least: "There must have been more than a thousand in 1880 and probably twice that many in the later years." (The italics are not his.) Indeed, one cannot escape the impression that he prefers readability to accuracy, and that, as he says on page 165, he believes "It matters little whether things happened as they are said to have happened."

CLIFFORD WILSON

Winnipeg

SHORTER NOTICES

Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois. VII. La Bataille romantique au Canada français. Par SÉRAPHIN MARION. Hull: Les Editions l'Eclair. 1952. Pp. 187. \$1.85.

In this seventh volume of *Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois* M. Marion brings us to the dawn of the twentieth century. Herein he traces the story of the first impact of French romanticism upon French-Canadian writers, then gives us a dramatic picture of the exciting battle that arose between the new romanticists and the defenders of the classics, a battle that has been particularly acute, and which is by no means ended, in a French Canada that takes pride in its origins in the "grand siècle" of Louis XIV, the age of French classicism *par excellence*.

Of greatest interest is the author's discussion of the efforts of Thomas Chapais and Charles Savary to reconcile the two contending groups, and to find in such a reconciliation a basis for a distinctive French-Canadian literature. M. Marion hints that along this line of development there has indeed been found a vitalizing and fructifying source of inspiration for contemporary French-Canadian writers. We hope that he will pursue this thought in a subsequent volume on the twentieth century. This would provide a natural and fitting culmination to a very useful and worth-while history of the rise of French-Canadian literature based on a study of contemporary newspapers and journals.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

The University of Toronto

Torchbearer of Freedom: The Influence of Richard Price on Eighteenth Century Thought. By CARL B. CONE. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 209.

HITHERTO the "good Dr. Price," as Professor Cone calls him, has enjoyed a somewhat secondary repute amongst the intellectual figures of the late eighteenth century, and has been known chiefly as the author of a pro-revolutionary *Discourse* which helped to precipitate the publication of Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution*. In this readable and scholarly life we are shown Dr. Price as a well-known English liberal thinker who, long before the French Revolution, was concerned with problems of civil rights, and with programmes of social security, notably with various insurance schemes. He was, moreover, a champion of colonial liberties and of the American Revolution whose principles he wished to see applied in Great Britain and in France. It is, in fact, the story of his relations with Americans and of his support of the cause of the United States in Britain that forms the chief contribution of this work. From its pages Dr. Price emerges as a broadminded clergyman trying to apply the values of Christianity to the political and social problems of his day, and as such a man well worthy of study. Professor Cone's book should provide a stimulus to more thorough investigations of the lives and influence of other clergymen of this period whose support of social and political reform has been too much overlooked by historians.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

The University of Toronto

Foreigners in the Union Army and Navy. By ELLA LONN. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 724. \$8.50.

A companion to Miss Lonn's *Foreigners in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1940), this volume covers its broad ground thoroughly. The author gives the most space to the numerous Germans and Irish in the Union forces, but also discusses Canadians, British, French, and other aliens in Union ranks. She estimates that 246,840 Canadians resided in the Northern States in 1860. Her earlier work had reported (p. 209 n.) that Canadians claimed 40,000 volunteers in the Confederate Army. She now states (pp. 578-9) that 53,532 Canadians served in the Union Army. Particular items in her book that relate to Canadians include the adventures of a Canadian woman spy, Miss S. E. E. Edmonds of New Brunswick, and of Agnes

Leclercq, a French Canadian who became a colonel's wife and Princess Salm-Salm (p. 566). General Jacob D. Cox, it is noted, was born in Montreal, where his father built the roof for the Church of Notre Dame, while Colonel Joseph R. Scott, who fell mortally wounded at Stone's River (Murfreesboro), was a Canadian.

Miss Lonn devotes many pages to the frequent violations of the Canadian frontier by Union Army recruiters who lured away or kidnapped Canadians in Canada East and West and the Maritime Provinces. She quotes a defence of Canadian motives for enlisting in the Union Army (p. 68), but her treatment of Canadian bounty-jumpers adds nothing new. Her book makes excellent use of the Notes from the British Legation, XLII-LXXVII, and the Consular Dispatches, Quebec, I, III, VI, in the National Archives, Washington, D.C. However, it neglects data available in the French language newspapers of New York and in the Canadian press.

JOHN CHARLES BODGER

Corcoran, California

Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (1789-1950). By A. J. GRANT and HAROLD TEMPERLEY. Sixth edition, revised and edited by LILLIAN M. PENSON. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co. 1952. Pp. xxii, 603. \$5.00.

THE sixth edition of this famous textbook appears a few months short of the quarter century after the first edition. In the interval it has gone through some twenty impressions. Both the original authors have died since the fifth edition appeared in 1939, but Professor Penson had earlier been associated with both authors, and she was able to discuss the present revision with Professor Grant before his death in 1948. Down to 1914—for two-thirds of its length—the book remains unchanged. The latter part has been entirely rewritten, and the story has been carried down to 1950.

This new edition will be welcomed by teachers who wish to have an English view of recent events to place before their students. Its virtues and shortcomings remain substantially those of the original edition. It gains in value by beginning in 1789 rather than in 1815, but the devotion of one-quarter of its length to the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods limits the space available for subsequent developments. As before, the emphasis is on the political side, still more on international relations. National currents—political, social, economic, and intellectual—are dealt with only as they relate to the development of the European states system. In adhering to this pattern, Miss Penson is carrying out the intention of the original edition, which was dedicated to Briand, Stresemann, and Austen Chamberlain, and which aimed to provide the public of the twenties with "some direction as to the evils wrought by wars and some suggestions as to how they might have been averted in the past."

ROBERT A. SPENCER

The University of Toronto

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
BY MARGARET JEAN HOUSTON

Notice in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review. The following abbreviations are used: *B.R.H.*—*Bulletin des recherches historiques*; *C.H.R.*—*Canadian Historical Review*; *C.J.E.P.S.*—*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*; *R.H.A.F.*—*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*.

See also the quarterly bibliography published in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, "Letters in Canada," Part I, English-Canadian Letters, published each April, Part II, French- and New-Canadian Letters, published each July.

I. THE RELATIONS OF CANADA WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH

CAVELL, NIK. The Colombo Plan (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLIV (5), May, 1952, 202-13).

CLOUCH, OWEN, ed. *Journal of the Society of Clerks-at-the-Table in Empire Parliaments*. XIX. For 1950. London, Toronto: Butterworth & Co. 1951. Pp. 442. 30s.

HARLOW, VINCENT T. *The Founding of the Second British Empire, 1763-1793*. I. *Discovery and Revolution*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co. 1952. Pp. viii, 664. \$8.10. To be reviewed later.

HELLENTHAL, W. *Independence und Interdependence der Commonwealth Staaten* (*Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, CVII (4), 1951, 732-49).

RHOMAS, IVOR. Commonwealth et Empire britanniques: changements constitutionnels 1940-50 (*Civilisations*, I (4), 1951).

II. CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

FREEDMAN, MAX. The Lisbon Conference (*International Journal*, VII (2), spring, 1952, 85-93). A Canadian view on the conference.

GIBSON, JAMES A. Mr. Mackenzie King and the Blunt Pencil: Some Marginalia of Canadian Foreign Policy (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXII (1), spring, 1952, 19-24).

LONG, JOHN W., Jr. The Origin and Development of the San Juan Island Water Boundary Controversy (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, XLIII (3), July, 1952, 187-213).

LONN, ELLA. *Foreigners in the Union Army and Navy*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern]. 1951. Pp. x, 725. \$11.50. See p. 297.

MEISEL, JOHN. Public Affairs: A Note on Nato (*Queen's Quarterly*, LIX (2), summer, 1952, 226-34). "The conditions necessary to fulfil the short-term objectives of the West, as expressed in NATO, may endanger the realisation of its long-term objectives."

PEARSON, LESTER B. Canada's Policy in Asia (*United Asia*, IV (1), 1952, 37-40).

ROTVAND, GEORGES. NATO—a French View (*International Journal*, VII (2), spring, 1952, 107-15).

SANDWELL, B. K. North Atlantic—Community or Treaty (*International Journal*, VII (3), summer, 1952, 169-72).

SOWARD, F. H. Canada's Commitment to the Free World. (*New Commonwealth*, XXIV (1), July 7, 1952, 7-8).

WILLOUGHBY, WILLIAM R. U.S.—Canadian Partnership (*Social Education*, XVI (5), May, 1952, 196-200).

III. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

Canada, Department of National Defence, Army Headquarters, Historical Section. *Introduction to the Study of Military History for Canadian Students*. Second edition, enlarged and revised. Ottawa: Directorate of Military Training, Army Headquarters. 1952. Pp. vi, 74.

CIMON, HECTOR. Historique de l'organisation des ingénieurs au Canada (*Revue trimestrielle canadienne*, XXXVIII (149), printemps 1952, 3-14).

HAUSER, HEINRICH. *Kanada, Zukunftsland im Norden*. Bearbeitet von REINHARD JASPERT. Berlin: Safari-Verlag. [1950]. Pp. 265, illus.

HITSMAN, J. M. The First Canadian V.C. (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (12), March, 1952, 46-9). Lieutenant Alexander Roberts Dunn, who won the V.C. for gallantry at Balaclava, was born in Canada.

JACKSON, HAROLD MCGILL. *The Princess Louise Dragoon Guards: A History*. With a foreword by E. L. M. BURNS. Ottawa. 1952. Pp. 306, with maps and illustrations. \$3.95. Obtainable from The Princess Louise Dragoon Guards, 60 Queen St., Ottawa.

LOWER, ARTHUR R. M. Are There Canadians? (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (38), June 28, 1952, i, 17-18).

— Canada: *Nation and Neighbour*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1952. Pp. viii, 202. \$4.00. To be reviewed later.

— No Class in Canada? (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (40), July 12, 1952, 9, 18-19).

— Seeing the Pacific from Winnipeg (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (39), July 5, 1952, 11, 20).

PLYM, ALBIN. *Rallarliv i Canada*. Stockholm: Arbetarkulturs förlag. 1950. Pp. 320.

SCHREIBER, ILSE. *Canada, Welt des Weizens*. Durchgesehene Neuauflage. München: W. Andermann. [1951]. Pp. 334, illus. Published in 1943 under the title *Die Welt des Weizens und der Tränen*.

WILFRID, R. F. Le Franco-Américain n'est pas un étranger aux Etats-Unis (Société Historique Franco-Américain, *Bulletin*, 1951, 31-53). French exploration and settlement of the Atlantic seaboard of North America.

(3) New France

BOUMA, DONALD G. "Carte partie occidentale de la Nouvelle France ou Canada" as *It Was in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries in North America*. Goshen, Ind.: Donald G. Bouma, R.F.D. 5. 1952. \$1.15. See page 313.

CAMPEAU, LUCIEN. Un Site historique retrouvé (*R.H.A.F.*, VI (1), juin 1952, 31-41). The scene of the combat during which Fathers Jogues, Goupil, and Coureux fell into the hands of the Iroquois in 1642.

FAUTEUX, AEGIDIUS. Quelques Officiers de Montcalm (*R.H.A.F.*, V (3), déc. 1951, 404-15).

HIGH, JAMES, ed. An Englishman in the French Army in America, 1755 (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, XLVII (2), June, 1952, 103-9). The journal of Thomas Forbes, describing some of the French forts.

JENKINS, LAWRENCE WATERS. French and Indian War Records (*Essex Institute Historical Collections*, LXXXVIII (3), July, 1952, 206). "A Return of men Inlisted for His Majestys Service for a tottal reduction of Canada April 14-1760."

LAMONTAGNE, ROLAND. L'Influence de Colbert sur l'œuvre de Jean Talon (*R.H.A.F.*, VI (1), juin 1952, 42-61).

MALCHELOOSE, GÉRARD. Un Gentilhomme coureur de bois: Daniel Greysolon, sieur Du Lhut (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no. 16, 1951, 195-232).

MAURAUT, OLIVIER. Richelieu (Indre et Loire) (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no. 16, 1951, 95-115).

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA 301

MORIN, VICTOR. L'Emplacement du fort de Dollard des Ormeaux (R.H.A.F., VI (1), juin 1952, 3-19).

ROUSSEAU, JACQUES. Samuel de Champlain, botanist mexicain et antillais (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no. 16, 1951, 39-61).

SNIDER, C. H. J. In Search of the Griffon (*Ontario History*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 31-40). An account of La Salle's ship and of attempts to identify her wreckage.

(4) British North America before 1867

BRUCHÉSI, JEAN. Lettres d'un exilé (1837-39) (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no. 16, 1951, 63-82). A study of Papineau's letters written in exile.

CONNELY, MILDRED M. Sandwich, Detroit and Gabriel Richard, 1798-1832 (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 25-37).

GARA, LARRY. Propaganda Uses of the Underground Railway (*Mid-America*, XXXIV, new series XXIII (3), July, 1952, 155-71).

GOLDIN, CURSTON D. H. Causation of the War of 1812 (*Register of the Kentucky Historical Society*, April, 1951).

LANDON, FRED. When *Uncle Tom's Cabin* came to Canada (*Ontario History*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 1-5). An account of the impact of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* on Canadians.

MACKENZIE, JOHN. Canada's First Government House (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLV (1), July, 1952, 41). Alwington House, Kingston, was occupied by the Canadian governors-general from 1841 to 1844.

Mgr Ignace Bourget et les décorations papales de Lafontaine, Wilson et Viger (R.H.A.F., VI (1), juin 1952, 110-11).

ROBERT, ADOLPHE. Gabriel Franchère (Société Historique Franco-Américain, *Bulletin*, 1951, 77-86).

Rome et *L'Histoire du Canada de Brasseur de Bourbourg* (R.H.A.F., VI (1), juin 1952, 112-18).

WALLACE, W. S. Notes of an 18th Century Northerner (*The Beaver*, outfit 283, June, 1952, 39-41). "Peter Fidler's notebook gives an insight into the character and the activities of this famous northern traveller."

(5) Canada since 1867

BEATTIE, EARL. The Strike That Terrified All Canada (*Maclean's*, LXV (11), June 1, 1952, 16-17, 39-40, 42, 44-5). An account of the Winnipeg General Strike.

BRAITHWAITE, MAX. Beginning of the Canadian Red Cross (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLIV (3), March, 1952, 138-9). The Red Cross flag was first used in Canada during the Rebellion of 1885.

GÉRIN-LAJOIE, PAUL. Vers une constitution nouvelle (*Assurances*, XX (1), avril 1952, 1-8).

HAY, IAN. *Arms and the Men*. The Second World War, 1939-1945, a Popular Military History, by various authors; in eight volumes. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1950. Pp. viii, 331. \$2.40. Obtainable from the United Kingdom Information Office, 275 Albert Street, Ottawa. See p. 289.

LEAR, JOHN. Canada Today (*Collier's*, Aug. 9, 1952, 57-73).

LINKLATER, ERIC. *The Campaign in Italy*. The Second World War, 1939-1945, a Popular Military History, by various authors; in eight volumes. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1951. Pp. x, 481. \$2.85. Obtainable from the United Kingdom Information Office, 275 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario. See p. 289.

MACDONNELL, J. A. The Progressive Conservative Party: A Stocktaking (*Canadian Forum*, XXXII (378), July, 1952, 81-3).

MCNAUGHT, JACK. The Nightmare Convoy of the Atlantic (*Maclean's*, LXV (10), May 15, 1952, 12-13, 42-5). An event of World War II.

PRATT, E. J. *Towards the Last Spike: A Verse-Panorama of the Struggle to Build the*

First Canadian Transcontinental from the Time of the Proposed Terms of Union with British Columbia (1870) to the Hammering of the Last Spike in the Eagle Pass (1885). Toronto: Macmillan, 1952. Pp. viii, 54. \$2.00.

SANDWELL, B. K. The BNA Act and "Dominion" (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (42), July 26, 1952, 5, 36).

SCHMITT, GILBERT R. Canadian Politicians and the Bench (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (41), July 19, 1952, 7).

IV. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(1) Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces

CAMPBELL, M. R. The History of Basic Steel Manufacture at Sydney, Nova Scotia (*Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Bulletin*, XLV (482), June, 1952, 331-9).

MAUNDER, ERN. The Ocean in Chains (*Atlantic Guardian*, IX (7), July, 1952, 16-17). Three times, in 1796, 1914-18, and during World War II, the Narrows of St. John's has been barricaded to keep out enemy ships.

New Brunswick Museum, Department of Canadian History. *History Bulletin*. I (1); I (2). Saint John, N.B. March; June, 1952. Pp. 3. Free, on application to George MacBeath, Curator.

RYAN, DON W. S. The King's Man of Carmanville (*Atlantic Guardian*, IX (6), June, 1952, 11-12). Notes on John Day, a Newfoundland pioneer.

SCLANDERS, IAN. North America's Oldest Boomtown (*Maclean's*, LXV (11), June 1, 1952, 18-19, 24, 26, 29-30). St. John's, Newfoundland.

— The Salty Spell of St. Andrews (*Maclean's*, LXV (16), Aug. 15, 1952, 16-17, 47-9). A history of the town of St. Andrews, N.B.

WHITE, JACK. The Legend of Piper's Hole (*Atlantic Guardian*, IX (7), July, 1952, 21-2). A folktale of Newfoundland.

(2) The Province of Quebec

ANDERSON, A. C. Life at Lachine (*The Beaver*, outfit 283, June, 1952, 28-31). The autobiography, started about the year 1878 and never finished, of Alexander Caulfield Anderson of the Hudson's Bay Company; introduction by Madgie Woldenden.

Comité de la Survivance française en Amérique. *La Vie franco-américaine*, 1950. Québec: le secrétaire, M. l'abbé Paul-Emile Gosselin, Université Laval. 1951. Pp. 408. \$5.00.

DEBROIS, LÉO-PAUL. Le Quebec Herald (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 83-94). A study of a Quebec newspaper published in the last years of the eighteenth century.

DOUVILLE, RAYMOND. Trois Seigneuries sans seigneurs (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 133-70).

DUFEBVRE, B. Le Cœur de Chénier (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (10), juin 1952, 839-43). The author discusses an incident connected with the battle of Saint Eustache in 1837.

GOSSELIN, PAUL-ÉMILE. Solidarité française (Société Historique Franco-Américain, *Bulletin*, 1951, 5-15).

GROULX, L. *Crise de fidélité française?* L'Œuvre des Tracts, no 390. Montréal. Juin 1952. Pp. 16. 15c.

The Manufacturers of Montreal [1856] (R.H.A.F., VI (1), juin 1952, 123-39). Extract from *Montreal in 1856: A Sketch Prepared for the Celebration of the Opening of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, by a Sub-Committee of the Celebration Committee* (Montreal, 1856).

MORIN, VICTOR. Clubs et sociétés notoires d'autrefois (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 233-70).

MORISSET, GEORGES. *Québec: Les Champs des Batailles Nationaux: Where Are the Plains of Abraham?* Québec: Les Editions Cap Diamant, 456, S.-Cyrille. Pp. 12, avec carte. The historic battlefield was not "Les Plaines d'Abraham" but "Les Plaines des Ursulines." Abraham Martin's old property had no connection with the battleground.

— La Trompeuse Légende des Plaines d'Abraham et la véridique histoire des Plaines des Ursulines (*La Patrie*, juin 29, 1952, 29, 32).

Rome et la codification des lois du Québec en 1865 (*R.H.A.F.*, VI (1), juin 1952, 118-23).

Société Historique Franco-Américaine. *Bulletin*, 1951. Manchester, N.H.: Imprimerie Ballard Frères. 1952. Pp. 118. Papers from the *Bulletin* are listed separately in this bibliography.

WARD, WALLACE. The Quebec of the Visitors (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (40), July 12, 1952, 23, 36).

(3) The Province of Ontario

CRAIG, G. M. British Travelers in Upper Canada, 1815-1837 (*Ontario History*, XLIII (4), Oct., 1951, 177-87).

FARQUHARSON, R. A. The Rise and Fall of the UFO (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (37), June 21, 1952, 10, 17-18).

— When Sir Adam Beck Tried to Be Premier (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (36), June 14, 1952, 18, 20).

HAMIL, FRED COYNE. Colonel Talbot and the Early History of London (*Ontario History*, XLIII (4), Oct., 1951, 159-75).

SMITH, D. W. Thames—Its Banks (*Ontario History*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 15-22). Diary of Governor Simcoe's return journey from Detroit to Niagara, transcribed and annotated by R. M. Lewis.

STIMSON, M. MASEFIELD. Strong Are the Ties (*Inland Seas*, VIII (2), summer, 1952, 83-9). The relations between Windsor and Detroit.

UNDERHILL, FRANK H. Power Politics in the Ontario C.C.F. (*Canadian Forum*, XXXII (375), April, 1952, 1, 4).

WAY, RONALD L. Old Fort Henry (*American Heritage*, spring, 1952, 52-5).

WOODS, W. G. Pioneer Mill (*Ontario Hydro News*, XXXIX (4), April, 1952, 18, 21). Notes on a grist mill erected in Waterloo, Ont., in 1816.

(4) The Prairie Provinces

ARCHER, JOHN H. The Saskatchewan Purchasing Company: An Early Co-operative (*Saskatchewan History*, V (2), spring, 1952, 55-65).

AYRES, FRED D. First Ascent of Mount Willerval (*Canadian Alpine Journal*, XXXV, 1952, 40-3).

DEAN, BASIL. Whither Social Credit in Alberta? (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (38), June 28, 1952, 9).

EAST, M. A. *The Saskatoon Story, 1882-1952*. Saskatoon. 1952. Pp. 86. \$2.75. Obtainable from Hazen-Twiss Ltd., Saskatoon.

HAMILTON, DOROTHY. Alberta Folklore and Local History (Canadian Library Association, *Bulletin*, VIII (6), May, 1952, 157-9).

MEDD, AGNES. Adventures of the *Marquis* (*The Beaver*, outfit 283, June, 1952, 24-5). The *Marquis*, a sternwheeler built in 1882, navigated the Saskatchewan River for several years.

RICH, E. E. and JOHNSON, A. M., eds. *Cumberland House Journals and Inland Journal, 1775-82: First Series, 1775-9*. With an introduction by RICHARD GLOVER. The Publications of the Hudson's Bay Record Society, XIV. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society. 1951. Pp. xcvi, 382, xiv. To be reviewed later.

ROGERS, D. B. Saskatchewan's Skin-deep Socialism (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (30), May 3, 1952, 11, 22-3).

SHARP, PAUL F. The Northern Great Plains: A Study in Canadian-American Regionalism (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXXIX (1), June, 1952, 61-76). The author discusses the interdependence between the Canadian and American frontiers, parallel developments in the two societies, and differences between them.

SHIPLEY, Mrs. R. L., ed. *From Oxen to Airplane: Mantario, 1908-1950*. Mantario, Sask.: Mantario Homemakers' Club, [1951.] Pp. 104, illus., maps. \$2.00.

SMYTH, E. H. J. First Ascents in the Palliser-Kananaskis Area (*Canadian Alpine Journal*, XXXV, 1952, 44-9).

WATSON, Mrs. EDWARD. Recollections and Reminiscences (*Saskatchewan History*, V (2), spring, 1952, 66-7). Experiences of a pioneer at Craik, Sask., in the early 1900's.

WILSON, CLIFFORD. Battles on Hudson's Bay (*American Heritage*, winter, 1951).

WILTS, CHARLES H. First Ascents from Lynx Creek Valley (*Canadian Alpine Journal*, XXXV, 1952, 28-34).

WRIGHT, JIM. Saskatchewan's North (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLV (1), July, 1952, 14-33).

(5) The Province of British Columbia

DUDRA, JOHN L. The First Ascent of Mt. Saugstad, 12-17 (*Canadian Alpine Journal*, XXXV, 1952, 12-17).

HARDY, WILLIAM. The Burrard Inlet Cattle Trail from Lillooet (*Museum & Art Notes*, II (2), 2nd series, April, 1952, 43-9). An account of the attempts, from 1846 to 1875, to provide a route entirely within British territory from the sea to the interior of British Columbia.

LOKEN, ROY N. The Martial Law Controversy in Washington Territory, 1856 (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, XLIII (2), April, 1952, 91-119). An account of a controversy involving employees of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company.

MARIOTT, ANNE. Hopeful Prince (*Canadian Forum*, XXXII (378), July, 1952, 83-5). Notes on the history and development of Prince George, B.C.

MATTHEWS, JAMES SKITT. *The Dedication of Stanley Park, 1889*. Vancouver: City Archives, 1952. Pp. 16, illus.

NESBITT, J. K. Always Spring in Saanich (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (39), July 5, 1952, 12, 21). An account of Saanich, B.C.

REYNOLDS, MAC. How Social Credit Took B.C. (*Maclean's*, LXVI (17), Sept. 1, 1952, 7-9, 54, 56-7).

SOARS, NORMAN. A Derelict Fort in Northern British Columbia (*Museum & Art Notes*, II (2), 2nd series, April, 1952, 33-5). Rocky Mountain Fort, on the Peace River, was built about 1797.

(6) Northwest Territories, Yukon, and the Arctic

CARPENTER, EDMUND S. The Future of the Eskimos (*Canadian Forum*, XXXII (377), June, 1952, 54-5).

CLIFFORD, NICHOLAS R. First Ascents of Mount Hubbard and Mount Alverston, 1951 (*Canadian Alpine Journal*, XXXV, 1952, 5-11).

CYRIAX, R. J. The Position of Victory Point, King William Island (*Polar Record*, VI (44), July, 1952, 496-507). "The writer establishes that Ross's Victory Point, for many years accepted as the place where the members of Franklin's last expedition encamped after abandoning their ships, is in all probability a headland several miles north of that encampment."

HUNTSMAN, A. C. Population versus Resources (*Queen's Quarterly*, LIX (2), summer, 1952, 149-161). A discussion of the problem of population for the Canadian North.

LEBOURDAIS, D. M. Arctic Honor for Stefansson (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (37), June 21, 1952, 12, 34). An account of some of Stefansson's discoveries.

MOON, BARBARA. How Mount Logan Was Conquered (*Maclean's*, LXV (13), July 1, 1952, 18-19, 28, 30, 32).

WATSON, JESSIE W. The Mackenzie Basin (*Geographical Magazine*, XXIV (10), Feb., 1952, 483-91).

V. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Canada, National Library Advisory Committee. *Progress Report and Recommendations Submitted to the Hon. F. Gordon Bradley, Secretary of State of Canada, Ottawa, November, 1951*. Ottawa. 1952. Pp. 12.

GAGNON, ONÉSIME. *Cultural Developments in the Province of Quebec: Minorities' Rights and Privileges under the Educational System*. Duncan & John Gray Memorial Lecture. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. vi, 21. 50c.

HENDERSON, J. L. H. The Founding of Trinity College, Toronto (*Ontario History*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 7-14).

IRVING, JOHN A., ed. *Philosophy in Canada: A Symposium*. With an Introduction by FULTON H. ANDERSON. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. 48. 75c.

JOWSEY, RALPH. *The First Sixty Years: A History of Eden School and District from 1890 to 1950*. Saltcoats, Sask.: The author. 1950. Pp. 46 (mimeo.).

LA PLANTE, LÉOPOLD. Un Collège acadien en Nouvelle-Ecosse (*Relations*, XII (140), août 1952, 218-20).

LEMELIN, ROGER. The Silent Struggle at Laval (*Maclean's*, LXV (15), Aug. 1, 1952, 10-11, 36-8).

MACLENNAN, HUGH. Jotham Logan: A Personal Tribute (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXII (1), spring, 1952, 15-18). An appreciation of a Nova Scotian teacher.

MAHEUX, ARTHUR. Le Séminaire de Québec en 1848 (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (10), juin 1952, 795-801).

— L'Université Laval et la culture française en Canada (*Culture*, XIII (2), juin 1952, 117-26).

The National Library (Canadian Library Association, *Bulletin*, IX (1), July, 1952, 6-7). A summary of discussion in the House of Commons, May 20, 1952.

PRESTON, R. A. The Humanities in Cadet Colleges (*R.M.C. Review*, XXXIII, 1952, 86-95).

PROVOST, HONORIUS. Les Cent Ans de la Faculté des arts (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (9), mai 1952, 752-6).

REED, T. A., ed. *A History of the University of Trinity College, Toronto, 1852-1952*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 313, illus. \$3.50. To be reviewed later.

ROWE, F. W. The History of Education in Newfoundland (*Canadian Education*, VII (2), March, 1952, 64-77).

SCAMMEL, HAROLD L. The Rise and Fall of a College (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXII (1), spring, 1952, 35-44). An account of the controversy, in the 1820's and 1830's, over the Presbyterian college at Pictou, N.S.

SHOOK, L. K. The Coming of the Basilians to Assumption College: Early Expansion of St. Michael's College (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 59-73).

VI. RELIGIOUS HISTORY

Canadian Catholic Historical Association. *Report*, 1951. Ottawa. 1951. Pp. 137. Bound with La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51. Articles are listed separately in this bibliography.

CARON, VINCENT. La Paroisse de Pain Court (La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51, 55-71). History of a western Ontario parish. Congrégation de Notre-Dame. *La Bienheureuse Marguerite Bourgeoys, sa béatification*. Montréal. 1951. Pp. 320, illus. \$12.00.

DANCE, D. L. The Diocese of Qu'Appelle (*Canadian Churchman*, LXXIX (10), May 15, 1952, 154-5).

The Diocese of Quebec (*Canadian Churchman*, LXXIX (14), July 17, 1952, 220-2).

GODBOUT, ARTHUR. La Première Paroisse de l'Ontario: l'Assomption de Sandwich (La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51, 39-53).

HILL, JAMES M. Archbishop Seghers, Pacific Coast Missionary (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 15-23).

KYTE, E. C. Two Diaries (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 24-31). Accounts of the diaries of Cornelius Bryant and Charles Ladner, Methodist ministers in British Columbia.

LANDON, FRED. Some Letters of James Evans (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 5-10). The work of a Methodist missionary among the Canadian Indians from 1831 to 1846.

MACDONALD, GEORGE F. Forgotten Facts about Assumption Parish, Sandwich, Ontario (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 39-45).

MARION, SÉRAPHIN. Mgr Bruchési, Mgr Rozier et la Troisième République (La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51, 15-24).

PARE, GEORGE. Pierre Potier, S.J. (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 47-57). The work of a missionary of New France.

REARDON, JAMES M. George Anthony Belcourt, Pioneer Missionary of the Northwest (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 75-89).

ROME, DAVID. Jewish Tie with Newfoundland (*Canadian Jewish Chronicle*, XXXIX (49), April 18, 1952, 4). Rabbi Carigal, a native of Palestine, visited Newfoundland in 1773.

ROYLE, E. C. *An Historical Study of the Anglican Parish of Vaudreuil*. Hudson Heights, Que. 1952. Pp. 76 (mimeo.). \$1.00 (paper), \$1.50 (bound).

SISONS, C. B., intro. by George Ryerson to Sir Peregrine Maitland, 9 June 1826 (*Ontario History*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 23-9). A letter which "presents a picture of the state of religion amongst several of the tribes of Indians in Upper Canada . . . [and] records the origin of Sunday Schools in that province."

La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique. *Rapport*, 1950-51. Ottawa. 1951. Pp. 83. Bound with Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951. Papers are listed separately in this bibliography.

TESSIER, ALBERT. Un Curé missionnaire: l'abbé S.-N. Dumoulin (1793-1853) (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 117-31).

TREMBLAY, PIERRE. Un Cas de théologie spirituelle au Canada (La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51, 29-37). A discussion of the journal of Marie-Claire Tremblay (1916-39) of Joliette, Quebec.

WALKER, FRANKLIN ARTHUR. Protestant Reaction in Upper Canada to the "Popish Threat" (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 91-107).

WOOD, KERRY. Big Family (*Country Guide*, June, 1952, 12, 63). The life of Rev. George Wood, pioneer minister in the West, and founder of the Wood's Christian Home orphanage, Calgary.

VII. GENEALOGY

BORDUAS, JEAN-RODOLPHE. Généalogie et petite histoire: la recherche de nos origines

françaises (*Mémoires de la Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française*, IV (4), juin 1951, 193-5).

GAUTHIER, ALPHONSE. Pierre Gauthier dit Saguingoira, un tout premier pionnier de Lachine (*Mémoires de la Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française*, IV (4), juin 1951, 196-208).

GAUVIN, ANDRÉ-ALBERT. Jean Gauvin (*Mémoires de la Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française*, IV (4), juin 1951, 208-16). An account of an early settler at Quebec.

GODBOUT, A. Les Emigrants de 1664 (*Mémoires de la Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française*, IV (4), juin 1951, 217-25).

GRENIER, AIMÉ. *Charles Garnier (Sieur de Bois-Fontaine), ancêtre des Grenier de Beauport, venu au Canada en 1663, de Tournebu, en Normandie*. Saint-Basile, Qué.: l'auteur. 1951. Pp. 184, illus. \$2.00.

MCNITT, VIRGIL V. *The MacNaughtan Saga: A Story-book History of an Ancient Clan and Its Branches*. Vols. I, II. With illustrations and biographies. Palmer, Mass. 1951. \$20 (U.S.). Three chapters (pp. 135-66) deal with General A. G. L. McNaughton, and there is mention of immigrants to Nova Scotia.

ROY, PIERRE-GEORGES. René Robineau de Portneuf et ses enfants (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 171-93).

VERRETTE, ADRIEN. Généalogie et histoire (Société Historique Franco-Américain, *Bulletin*, 1951, 87-92).

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

BROWN, H. P. Alberta in Films (Canadian Library Association, *Bulletin*, VIII (6), May, 1952, 168).

COULSON, FRANCES. Alberta in Books (Canadian Library Association, *Bulletin*, VIII (6), May, 1952, 160-4).

FAUTEUX, AEGIDIUS. Les Débuts de l'imprimerie au Canada (*Les Cahiers des Dix*, no 16, 1951, 17-37).

GRANT, JOHN W. Archives and History at Union College (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 20-3). An account of the archives of Union College of British Columbia.

HAYWOOD, CHARLES. *A Bibliography of North American Folklore and Folksong*. New York: Greenberg [Toronto: Ambassador Books]. 1951. Pp. xxx, 1292. \$33.

RAY, MARGARET. The Peter Jones Collection, Victoria University (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 11-15). The latest addition to material on Peter Jones is a letter book containing letters written by the Indian missionary between 1833 and 1846.

STOTT, WILLIAM. Vancouver City Archives (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 35-7).

TANGHE, RAYMOND. *Pour un système cohérent de bibliothèques au Canada français*. Lettre de S.E. Mgr P.-E. LÉGER; Préface du R.P. PAUL-AIMÉ MARTIN. Montréal: Fides. 1952. Pp. 38. 50c.

TREMAINE, MARIE. *A Bibliography of Canadian Imprints, 1751-1800*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. xxviii, 705. \$10.00. To be reviewed later.

WOODLEY, E. C. French Protestant Archives (*The Bulletin: Records and Proceedings of the Committee on Archives of the United Church of Canada*, no. 5, 1952, 32).

IX. ARTS AND SCIENCES

(1) Literature, Art, and Music

AYRE, ROBERT. The New Muhlstock (*Canadian Art*, IX (4), summer, 1952, 140-3).

Comment on development in the painting of Louis Muhlstock.

BRUCHÉSI, JEAN. Ancienne et nouvelle *Revue Canadienne* (*Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, XLV, 3^e série, sect. I, 1951, 1-8).

BUCHANAN, DONALD W. The Biennale of Venice Welcomes Canada (*Canadian Art*, IX (4), summer, 1952, 144-7). In 1952, for the first time, Canada has entries in the Venice exhibition.

COLEMAN, E. G. The Growth of Canadian Ballet (*Canadian Forum*, XXXI (372), Jan., 1952, 226-7).

COLLIN, W. E. Quebec's Changing Literature (*Canadian Forum*, XXXI (374), March, 1952, 274-6).

CREIGHTON, HELEN. Folk-Singers of Nova Scotia (*Canadian Forum*, XXXII (378), July, 1952, 86-7).

DUVAL, PAUL. *Alfred Joseph Casson, President, Royal Canadian Academy*. Canadian Art Series. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1952. Pp. 64, illus. \$4.50.

— Canadians Revue Stained-Glass Art (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (26), April 12, 1952, 13).

— Portraits à la Pellan (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (38), June 28, 1952, 11). The painting of Alfred Pellan.

COULET, ELIE. Autour du monde avec Jaques Hébert (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (10), juin 1952, 811-21).

— Mgr Savard, un maître de notre littérature (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (8), avril 1952, 648-58).

COUR, ROMAIN. Maurice Cullen, un maître de l'art au Canada (1866-1934) (*Qui?* III (3), mars 1952, 41-64).

GOWANS, ALAN. Thomas Baillaigé and the Québécois Tradition of Church Architecture (*Art Bulletin*, XXXIV (2), June, 1952, 117-37).

HARPER, J. RUSSELL. A Sketch-Book of Cornelius Krieghoff (*Canadian Art*, IX (4), summer, 1952, 163-4). The discovery of one of Krieghoff's sketch-books throws new light on his work.

HARTMAN, MARIA. Chiefswood (*Family Herald and Weekly Star*, LXXXIII (9), Feb. 28, 1952, 34). Notes on the literary and historical associations of Pauline Johnson's birthplace.

KALLMAN, HELMUT, ed. *Catalogue of Canadian Composers*. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 1952. Pp. 254. \$3.40.

LEBOURDAIS, ISABEL. A Canadian Worth Celebrating (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (32), May 17, 1952, 14). An article on Germaine Guévremont.

LIVESAY, DOROTHY. Ethel Wilson, West Coast Novelist (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (42), July 26, 1952, 20, 36).

MARION, SÉRAPHIN. *Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois*. VII. *La Bataille romantique au Canada français*. Hull, Qué: Les Editions l'Eclair; Ottawa: Editions de l'Université. 1952. Pp. 187. \$1.85. See p. 298.

MAURA, Sister. The Short Story (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXI (4), winter, 1952, 285-90). The author deals in part with the development of the short story in Canada, particularly in Nova Scotia.

MORISSET, GÉRARD. La Sculpture religieuse sous le régime français (La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, *Rapport*, 1950-51, 25-7).

Ontario Society of Artists. *Eightieth Spring Exhibition*, 1952. Toronto: The Society, 170 St. Clements Ave., Toronto. 1952. Pp. 51, illus. Free. Catalogue of an exhibition held at the Art Gallery of Toronto, March 8-April 13, 1952.

PACEY, DESMOND. *Creative Writing in Canada: A Short History of English-Canadian Literature*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1952. Pp. x, 220. \$4.00.

PHELPS, ARTHUR L. *Canadian Writers*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, Publishers. 1951. Pp. viii, 119. \$2.00.

RINGUET. Journalisme d'hier et d'aujourd'hui (*La Nouvelle Revue canadienne*, I (6), fév.-mars 1952, 21-5).

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA 309

ROY, CARMEN. *Contes populaires gaspésiens*. Illustrations de MADELEINE LALIBERTÉ. Collection la Grande Aventure. Montréal: Fides. 1952. Pp. 160, illus. \$1.00.

SUTHERLAND, JOHN. E. J. Pratt: A Major Contemporary Poet (*Northern Review*, V (3, 4), Feb.-March, April-May, 1952, 36-64).

SYLVESTRE, GUY. Naissance de nos lettres (*Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, XLV, 3^e série, sect. I, 1951, 71-8). Early French-Canadian literature.

— The Recent Development of the French-Canadian Novel (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXI (2), Jan., 1952, 167-8).

Vancouver Art Gallery. *Recent Quebec Painting: An Exhibition Organized by the National Gallery of Canada with the Vancouver Art Gallery 1951-52*. Vancouver: Western Association of Art Museum Directors. 1951. Pp. 29 (plates). Catalogue of the third in a series of exhibitions organized by the Vancouver Art Gallery for tour on the circuit operated by the Western Association of Art Museum Directors.

(2) Science and Agriculture

ANDERSON, A. L. The School of Medical Sciences and the Medical College of the University of Saskatchewan (Calgary Associate Clinic, *Historical Bulletin*, XVII (1), May, 1952, 1-9). The tenth in a series of histories of Canadian medical schools.

BOSSET, HYE. Canada and the Fact Film (*Canadian Film Weekly*, XVII (32), Aug. 20, 1952, 7, 17). Early use of the factual film in Canada.

Canada, Dept. of Agriculture, Agricultural Economics Division. *Changes in Agriculture in Dundas County, Ontario*. By J. A. DAWSON. Ottawa. 1952. Pp. 16.

FRY, H. S. Then and Now—1874-1951 (*Agricultural Institute Review*, VII (3), May, 1952, 33-4, 36, 64). A review of some of the developments in Canadian agriculture.

HINGSTON, WILLIAM H. William Hales Hingston, M.D. (1829-1907) (Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 109-20).

KELSALL, ARTHUR. Early Canadian Agriculture, with Particular Reference to the Maritimes (*Agricultural Institute Review*, VII (3), May, 1952, 15-17, 66).

WETHERELL, ALICE. Charles Daniel Parfitt (*Ontario History*, XLIV (2), April, 1952, 46-56). The biography of an outstanding Ontario physician.

(3) Geography, Transportation, and Migration

ANGELL, Sir NORMAN. *Freer Migration and Western Security*. Eleanor Rathbone Memorial Lecture. Liverpool: At the University Press. 1951. Pp. 18. 1s. 6d.

BAUDRY, RENÉ. D'où viennent les noms "Bras d'Or" et "Labrador"? (*R.H.A.F.*, VI (1), juin 1952, 20-30).

BOGUE, A. G. and BENSON, LILLIAN R., eds. *An Engineer on the Great Western: A Selection from the Personal Reminiscences of Silas Wright Burt*. Western Ontario History Nuggets, no. 17. London, Ont.: Lawson Memorial Library, University of Western Ontario. 1952. Pp. 35.

Canada, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Geographical Branch. *An Introduction to the Geography of the Canadian Arctic*. Canadian Geography Information Series no. 2. Prepared under the supervision of N. L. NICHOLSON. Ottawa. 1951. Pp. xiv, 118, with maps and illustrations. 50c.

FRÉMONT, DONATIEN. Un Apôtre de la colonisation française dans l'Ouest canadien: l'abbé Jean Gaire (*Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, XLV, 3^e série, sect. I, 1951, 9-14).

FRIEDMANN, W. Migration and World Politics (*International Journal*, VII (3), summer, 1952, 196-203).

HARE, F. KENNETH. The Labrador frontier (*Geographic Review*, XLII (3), July, 1952, 405-24).

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MRS. R. F. McWILLIAMS

Mrs. R. F. McWilliams, wife of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, died in her home in Winnipeg last April, at the age of 76, after a distinguished career of public service. She was born in Toronto, graduated from the University of Toronto in 1898, and received the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters from the same university in 1948. She was widely known for her activity in women's affairs and for her advocacy of women's participation in public life. She herself held a variety of public offices from the municipal to the international sphere.

She was especially active in the Manitoba Historical Society and did a great deal to stimulate publication in the field of Manitoban history. She was the author of several historical works, including *Manitoba Milestones* and *This New Canada*.

DR. W. I. MORSE

Dr. William Inglis Morse, a well-known authority in Nova Scotian history, died at his home in Cambridge, Mass., on June 5, his seventy-eighth birthday. Born in Paradise, N.S., he graduated from Acadia in 1897 and the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass. in 1900. Subsequently he received the honorary degrees of D.Litt. from Acadia and LL.D. from Dalhousie.

After retiring as rector of the Church of the Incarnation, Lynn, Mass. in 1930 he devoted much of his time to the collection of rare books and manuscripts concerning the early history of Nova Scotia. He was the author of various historical works, including *Gravestones of Acadia* (1930), *Land of New Adventure* (1932), *Acadiensia Nova*, and *Pierre du Gua, Sieur de Monts* (1939). According to the *New York Times* he has been honorary curator of Canadian history and literature at Harvard for the last nine years.

PERSONAL ITEMS

Further items for inclusion under this heading will be welcome

The University of Alberta announces the retirement of Professor M. H. Long as Head of the Department of History. He will be succeeded by Professor Ross W. Collins. Lewis G. Thomas, Associate Professor of History, will spend the session of 1952-3 on sabbatical leave in Britain, doing research in the field of Western Canadian history.

Mount Allison University announces that Professor Donald G. G. Kerr, Head of the Department of History, will be on leave of absence during the 1952-3 session, continuing research in England on a Nuffield Fellowship. S. R. Mealing, a Rhodes Scholar from the University of Alberta, who has just completed three years at Oxford, has been appointed Sessional Lecturer in History.

At Brandon College, N. P. Zacour was appointed instructor in history in the autumn of 1951. W. D. Smith has been on leave of absence, doing post-graduate work at the University of Toronto.

At Carleton College, David M. L. Farr has been promoted from Lecturer to Assistant Professor of History. Margaret Wade Labarge has been appointed

Sessional Lecturer for 1952-3 and Gordon S. Couse has been granted leave of absence to study at the University of Chicago.

A l'Université Laval M. Marcel Trudel, professeur de l'Institut d'histoire, a obtenu le premier prix aux Concours littéraires de la province pour son ouvrage *Louis XVI, le Congrès américain et le Canada*. Il a été élu aussi à l'unanimité membre de l'Académie canadienne-française.

The appointment has been announced of Gordon O. Rothney as acting Professor of History in Memorial University of Newfoundland, replacing Professor A. M. Fraser, who will be away on leave for 1952-3. Professor Rothney has likewise been granted a year's leave of absence from Sir George Williams College, Montreal.

Rev. S. L. Pollard and Mr. Richard F. Callan have been appointed Lecturers in History at Sir George Williams College, Montreal.

At the University of Toronto Professor Chester Martin has retired as Head of the Department of History, a chair which he had held for twenty-two years. Professor Ralph Flenley has been appointed Chairman of the Department. J. B. Conacher and M. R. Powicke have been promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor. A. C. Turner, a special lecturer during the 1951-2 session, has been appointed as an Assistant Professor. John Cairns, who has recently completed his doctorate at Princeton, W.W. Piepenburg, a Fulbright Scholar from the University of Wisconsin, who has completed his doctorate at Cambridge, and Morris Zaslow, recently a Lecturer at Carleton College, have been appointed as Lecturers in the Department of History.

William K. Rolph, Special Lecturer at the University of Saskatchewan in 1950-1, was appointed Assistant Professor at Tulane University in the autumn of 1951. He has recently been awarded a grant from the Government of Australia to study agrarian movements in Western Australia.

CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

The Canadian Historical Association's annual meeting which was held at Laval University, Quebec City, Quebec, June 4-6, formed part of the University's centenary celebrations. Registration began on Wednesday afternoon, June 4. On Thursday morning, June 5, the conference was formally opened when Mgr Ferdinand Vandry, Rector of Laval University, welcomed members of the Association at a general session. At this session the following papers were read: "The Indian Background of Canadian History" by G. F. G. Stanley, "Les Origines de l'Université Laval" by Abbé Arthur Maheux, "Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Lord Minto" by H. Pearson Gundy, and "Les Canadiens français et la naissance de la Confédération" by Jean-Charles Bonenfant. On Thursday afternoon members of the Association were taken to visit the Ursuline Convent and during the visit a short sketch of the history of the convent was given by Father Adrien Pouliot, s.j. After leaving the Ursuline Convent the members paid a visit to the Retrospective Exhibition at the Quebec Provincial Museum and attended a reception in the Provincial Archives.

Thursday evening a joint session with the Canadian Political Science Association was held with His Excellency Mgr Maurice Roy, Archbishop of Quebec and Chancellor of Laval University, as chairman. Jean Bruchési, President of the Canadian Historical Association and the Very Reverend Father George H.

Lévesque, President of the Canadian Political Science Association, gave their presidential addresses on "L'Enseignement de l'Histoire du Canada" and "Sciences sociales et humanisme" respectively.

On Friday morning, June 6, a special session was held in co-operation with the Société historique de Québec to discuss the topic "The Canadian Historical Association, the *Canadian Historical Review*, and Local History." Statements were presented by Hilda Neatby (Local History Committee), J. B. Conacher (*CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*), R. A. Preston (*Canadian Historical Association Report*), Abbé Honorius Provost (Société historique de Québec), and Lewis H. Thomas (Provincial Archivist, Saskatchewan). Following discussion from the floor it was agreed that a summary of the proceedings should be included in the *Annual Report* and distributed to local historical societies. The *CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* was asked to publish its list of local societies, offprints of which were to be distributed to the societies along with the summary of the discussions. The list is appended at the end of these notes. The Editors would be glad to hear of any corrections or additions. At the general meeting J. B. Conacher presented a report of a special committee recommending the publication of a series of pamphlets by the Association. The pamphlets would aim at summarizing the latest historical research on a variety of topics, chiefly in the field of Canadian history, in a form acceptable to the general reading public. The project was considered primarily as a service to teachers and for this reason it was anticipated that it would be widened to include other fields of history as well. It was approved in principle by the Council.

On Friday afternoon the members enjoyed a visit to the Citadel during which Gérard Morisset gave an illustrated lecture on the fortifications of Quebec City. The visit to the Citadel was followed by a bus tour of the city.

The following officers were elected for the year 1952-3: President, C. P. Stacey; Vice-President, M. H. Long; English Secretary, D. M. L. Farr; French Secretary, Antoine Roy; Treasurer, W. G. Ormsby; Editor of the *Annual Report*, G. F. G. Stanley; Associate Editors of the *Annual Report*, P. G. Cornell and Leopold Lamontagne. The following four members were elected to the Council of the Association to take the place of those whose terms had expired: J. B. Conacher, Margaret Ormsby, Father Adrien Pouliot, s.j., and R. A. Preston.

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY

On May 20, 1952, the Prime Minister announced the Government's intention of introducing legislation to provide for the establishment of a National Library and the appointment of a national librarian in accordance with the recommendations of the *Massey Report*. The defence programme has made the immediate building of the Library impossible but the important task of preparing a national catalogue and other preliminary work are to be begun immediately. Dr. William Kaye Lamb, the Dominion Archivist, has been named the first Librarian of the National Library of Canada.

[This note was written before the recent fire in the Parliamentary Library which may possibly effect the decision about the date of building.]

BORDEN PAPERS

The National Archives have completed the microfilming of Sir Robert Borden's

den's papers, which had been presented by Mr. Henry Borden. Over 200,000 pages were photographed on some 112 reels, amounting to about two miles of 35 mm. film. A positive copy is being given to the University of Toronto where the work was done.

Sir Robert's papers were put in their present order twenty or more years ago, when he was starting work on his memoirs. A very detailed chronology was prepared; each entry is followed by references to the files relating to the event or topic noted. There is a subject index to the chronology, and this is in effect an index to the most important files in the papers themselves. Both the chronology and the index have been microfilmed, and they will thus be available to anyone making use of the film copies.

DISCOVERY OF CHAMPLAIN'S ASTROLABE COMMEMORATED

On the recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, a cut-stone monument has been built west of Cobden on Highway 17 by the Department of Resources and Development, at the place where, in 1867, Edward George Lee found an astrolabe thought to belong to the famous explorer, Samuel de Champlain. The instrument, used to determine latitude, bears the date 1603 and was found at a point where Champlain is known to have passed through on June 7, 1613, on an expedition up the Ottawa River.

The astrolabe is in the possession of the New York Historical Society, to which it was bequeathed in 1942.

A NEW MAP OF NEW FRANCE

Mr. Donald G. Bouma, a former member of the cartographic staff of the National Geographic Society, has sent us a copy of a map entitled "Carte partielle occidentale de la Nouvelle France ou Canada as It Was in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries in North America" (see p. 300). The map, especially drawn and printed by Mr. Bouma, is a fine example of the cartographer's art. It is printed in soft colours on a simulated paper and following the fashion of maps of the period there is an illustrated title in one corner showing typical scenes of Indians meeting French traders and missionaries.

The geographical outlines of the map are drawn accurately and clearly according to modern knowledge, but Mr. Bouma has tried to incorporate historical information from a variety of early maps. He has therefore had to make many arbitrary choices in names that are appropriate for one date but not for another. In spite of some historical inaccuracies the map is an attractive piece of craftsmanship with the atmosphere of the period which it illustrates.

INSTITUTE OF EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

The Institute of Early American History and Culture announces that it is prepared to provide a limited number of grants in aid of research to individual writers or scholars who are carrying on studies in the field of American history prior to the year 1815.

Requests for application forms and other information should be addressed to the Director, Institute of Early American History and Culture, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The Institute also announces an annual prize of \$500 for a published book in the field of early American history and culture.

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

The Society of American Archivists is holding its sixteenth annual meeting in Lexington, Kentucky, October 27-8. Among topics to be discussed are practical and technical problems of archivists, historical and business archives, and regional and local collections.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. MacNutt, in his interesting article on the coming of responsible government to New Brunswick, says: "Canadian nationalists are at a singular disadvantage compared with those of other countries for, unlike the French, British, and Americans, they can not manufacture the true stuff of nationality from the memories of a popular uprising." To a professional historian, this is no doubt perfectly clear; to a layman like me it isn't. Why can "the true stuff of nationality" come only "from the memories of a popular uprising"? Does "the true stuff" of English nationality come "from the memories of a popular uprising," and if so, what uprising? The Revolution of 1688? The Civil War? If these had not happened, would there be no "true stuff" of English nationality? If there had been no French Revolution, would there be no "true stuff" of French nationality? "The true stuff of American nationality" no doubt is closely bound up with the American Revolution; but does that single case establish a general rule?

I venture to suggest the point is important, for if Mr. MacNutt's conclusion is correct, there can never be a genuine Canadian nationality. We haven't had a revolution. Indeed, the most significant thing about our history is that we have repeatedly refused to have one. The nearest we came to it was 1837, and the most significant thing about the "uprisings" of that year is that they weren't "popular." Nobody rebelled in any of the Atlantic provinces, and only a small minority in either Upper or Lower Canada.

This may be fatal to the claims of some professional "Nationalists." Is it fatal to Canadian "nationality"? I should very much appreciate some expert enlightenment.

Miss Stewart's article on the state of Maine and Confederation, also most interesting, says: "Over the opposition of the Canadian delegates, the 'Kingdom' then became a 'Dominion.'" I should like to know what evidence there is for this very positive and strongly worded statement. There can, I think, be no question that the Fathers of Confederation would have preferred "Kingdom." But that is surely not the same thing as saying they "opposed" "Dominion"? Lord Carnarvon's letter to the Queen, February 7, 1867, says: "The North American delegates are anxious that the United Provinces should be designated as the 'Dominion of Canada.'" True or false?

Yours truly,

EUGENE FORSEY

Ottawa

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

D. J. McDougall is Professor of History at the University of Toronto.

HELEN TAFT MANNING is Professor of History at Bryn Mawr College. She is author of *British Colonial Government after the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1933).

WILBUR S. SHEPPERSON is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Nevada.

DAVID SPRING is Assistant Professor of History at Johns Hopkins University, at present on a year's leave of absence in the United Kingdom.

CANADIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

French-speaking

L'Association Canado-Américaine, Adolphe Robert, Président, Manchester, N.H., U.S.A.

Les Dix, Gérard Malchelosse, Secrétaire, 5759, avenue Durocher, Outremont, Qué.

Institut Canadien de Québec, 37, rue Sainte-Angèle, et 40, rue Saint-Stanislas, Qué.

Institut d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française, 261, avenue Bloomfield, Montréal

La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, Séraphin Marion, Secrétaire, Archives Publique du Canada, Ottawa

La Société d'Histoire des Cantons de l'Est, M. l'abbé Maurice O'Bready, Secrétaire, Séminaire St-Charles, Sherbrooke, Qué.

La Société d'Histoire du Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Casier postal 212, Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Qué.

La Société d'Histoire Régionale de Rimouski, Séminaire de Rimouski, Rimouski, Qué.

Société d'Histoire Régionale de Saint-Hyacinthe, Séminaire Sainte-Hyacinthe, Saint-Hyacinthe, Qué.

La Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française, Casimir Hébert, Secrétaire, 3985, rue St-Denis, Montréal 18

La Société Historique de la Chaudière, Rév. Frère Eloi-Gérard, Secrétaire, Collège du Sacré Cœur, Beaucheville-Ouest, Qué.

La Société Historique de la Côte Nord, Gérard Lefrançois, Secrétaire, Baie-Comeau (Saguenay), Qué.

La Société Historique Franco-Américaine, Antoine Clément, Secrétaire, 195 West Sixth Street, Lowell, Mass., U.S.A.

Société Historique de Joliette, Palais épiscopal, Joliette, Qué.

La Société Historique de Kamouraska, M. l'abbé Léon Bélanger, Secrétaire, Sainte-Anne de la Pocatière (Kam.), Qué.

Société Historique et Littéraire Acadienne, Université Saint-Joseph, Saint-Joseph, N.B.

Société Historique Métisse, Guillaume Charette, Secrétaire, St. Boniface, Man.

Société Historique de Montréal, Mme Albertine Ferland-Angers, Secrétaire, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 1210, rue Sherbrooke est, Montréal 24

Société Historique du Nord de l'Outaouais, Rév. H. Legros, 220, rue Laurier, Hull, Qué.

Société Historique du Nouvel-Ontario, Rév. Lorenzo Cadieux, S. J., Collège du Sacré-Cœur, Sudbury, Ont.

Société Historique d'Ottawa, M. l'abbé E. Thivierge, Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa

Société Historique de Québec, Université Laval, Québec

Société Historique de Rigaud, Collège Bourget, Rigaud, Qué.

Société Historique de Saint-Boniface, M. l'abbé A. d'Eschambault, Palais Archiépiscopal, St-Boniface, Man.

La Société Historique de Ste-Thérèse de Blainville, M. l'abbé Edmond Lacroix, Président, Ste-Thérèse, Qué.

La Société Historique du Saguenay, Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, Qué.

La Société Historique de Sorel, Robert Auger, Secrétaire, Sorel, Qué.

La Société Nicolétaine d'Histoire Régionale, M. l'abbé Walter Houle, Secrétaire, Séminaire de Nicolet, Nicolet, Qué.

Société Trifluvienne d'Histoire Régionale, Séminaire des Trois-Rivières, Les Trois-Rivières, Qué.

English-speaking

Amherstburg Historic Sites and Museum Commission, John A. Marsh, Secretary, Amherstburg, Ont.

Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal, Château de Ramezay, 490 Notre-Dame St. E., Montreal

Art, Historical and Scientific Association of Vancouver, T. P. O. Menzies, Curator, City Museum, Hastings and Main Sts., Vancouver

Assumption Historical Research Society, Assumption College, Windsor, Ont.

Brant Historical Society, Harold W. Hill, Secretary, 17 Hawarden Ave., Brantford, Ont.

British Columbia Historical Association, Provincial Library, Victoria, B.C.

Brome County Historical Society, H. B. Shufelt, Treasurer, 3556 Shuter St., Montreal

Canadian Catholic Historical Association, Mrs. E. T. McEvoy, Secretary, Britannia Bay, Ottawa

Canadian Military Institute, 426 University Ave., Toronto

Canadian Railroad Historical Association, O.S.A. Lavallee, 6959 De l'Epee ave., Montreal 15

Cape Breton Historical Society, Miss M. L. Mackenzie, Secretary, 54 Argyle St., Sydney, N.S.

Cape Sable Historical Society, Mrs. Sarah F. Richan, Secretary, Barrington Passage, N.S.

Champlain Society, Miss Julia Jarvis, Secretary, The Library, University of Toronto

Cowichan Historical Society, Kenneth Duncan, President, Duncan, B.C.

Dundas Historical Society, T. R. Woodhouse, President, 20 North Oval, Hamilton

Elgin Historical Society, J. C. Smith, Secretary, 34 Williams St., St. Thomas, Ont.

Fort Malden National Historic Park, Fort Malden Management Committee, Amherstburg, Ont.

Grand Manan Historical Society, Mrs. R. A. Ferguson, Secretary, North Head, N.B.

Great Lakes Historical Society, Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio

Haldimand County Historical Society, County Court House, Cayuga, Ont.

Head-of-the-Lake Historical Society, John M. Cowan, Secretary, 188 Holton St., S., Hamilton

Historical Association of Annapolis Royal, Dr. D. B. Hemmeon, Secretary, Box 68, Annapolis Royal, N.S.

Historical Society of Alberta, Rev. R. E. Finlay, Secretary, 11110, 82nd Ave., Edmonton

Historical Society of Argenteuil County, Miss Beatrice Robertson, Secretary, St. Andrews East, Que.

Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, W. L. Morton, Secretary, Provincial Library, Legislative Building, Winnipeg

History Association of Montreal, Miss Allana Reid, President, 152 Hillcrest Ave., Montreal West

Hudson's Bay Record Society, Michael R. Lubbock, Secretary, Canadian Committee, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg

Huronia Historic Sites and Tourist Association, Norman D. Clarke, President, c/o Chamber of Commerce, Barrie, Ont.

Kamloops Historical and Museum Association, 543 Battle St., Kamloops, B.C.

Kent County Museum Committee, Vernon Pritchard, Secretary, Chatham, Ont.

Kent Historical Society, Dr. E. M. Milner, Secretary, 208 William St., Chatham, Ont.

Kingston Historical Society, R. A. Preston, Secretary, Royal Military College, Kingston, Ont.

Kootenay Historical Society, Gordon Stace Smith, R.R. 1, Creston, B.C.

Leeds and Grenville Historical Society, Lt.-Col. F. C. Curry, President, Fulford Building, Brockville, Ont.

Lennox and Addington Historical Society, Rev. A. J. Wilson, Secretary, Napanee, Ont.

Lincoln Historical Society, G. M. Lampard, K.C., Secretary, 112 Queen St., St. Catharines, Ont.

Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, The Library, Morrin College, Stanislaus St., Quebec

London and Middlesex Historical Society, Leslie R. Gray, President, 20 Renwick Ave., London, Ont.

Lundy's Lane Historical Society, Mrs. Stanley C. Talon, Secretary, 1775 Brookfield Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

MacNab Historical Association, William Macnab Box, President, Box 155, Foleyet, Ont.

Miramichi Historical Society, Miss Louise Manny, Secretary, Newcastle, N.B.

Mississquoi Historical Society, C. O. Jones, President, Bedford, Que.

Morton Historical Association, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon

Niagara Historical Society, Rev. C. H. E. Smith, Secretary, St. Mark's Rectory, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.

Nicola Historical, c/o E. A. Morrison, The High School, Merritt, B.C.

Norfolk Historical Society, Eva Brook Danly Museum, Norfolk St., Simcoe, Ont.

Norfolk McCall Society, Miss Harriet Mabee, Secretary, Simcoe, Ont.

Norwich Pioneers Historical Society, Miss K. S. Mott, Secretary, R.R.3, Norwich, Ont.

Nova Scotia Historical Society, Dr. W. L. Payzant, K.C., Secretary, 92 Granville St., Halifax, N.S.

Okanagan Historical Society, Rev. J. C. Goodfellow, Secretary, Princeton, B.C.; H. Cochrane, Secretary, Penticton Branch; L. L. Kerry, Secretary, Kelowna Branch; H. R. Denison, Secretary, Vernon Branch; A. Katten, Secretary, Oliver-Osoyoos Branch

Ontario Historical Society, J. C. Boylen, 206 Huron St., Toronto 5

Oxford Historical Society, The Court House, Woodstock, Ont.

Oxford Museum Society, City Hall, Woodstock, Ont.

Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Waterloo College, Waterloo, Ont.

Perth and Lanark County Historical Society, Public Library Building, Perth, Ont.

Prince Albert Historical Society, Jan C. Collins, Secretary, Prince Albert Historical Museum, Prince Albert, Sask.

Prince Edward Historical Society, Mrs. E. A. Morden, Secretary, Picton, Ont.

Queen's County Historical Society, Thos. H. Raddall, Main St., Liverpool, N.S.

Royal Society of Canada, National Research Building, Ottawa

Saanich Pioneer Society, R. E. Nimmo, Secretary, Saanichton, B.C.

Similkameen Historical Association, Rev. J. C. Goodfellow, Secretary, Princeton, B.C.

South Okanagan Historical Society, R. N. Atkinson, President, Penticton, B.C.

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Historical Society, F. D. McLennan, Secretary, Drawer 908, Cornwall, Ont.

The Thompson Valley and District Historical and Museum Association, G. D. Brown, Secretary, 543 Battle St., Kamloops, B.C.

Thunder Bay Historical Society, K. W. Denis, Secretary, Box 416, Port Arthur, Ont.

United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada, Robert S. Johnston, President, 25 Hughson St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada, Vancouver Section, Miss Bessie P. Choate, Secretary, 3216 Gilpin St., New Westminster, B.C.

Upper Canada Railway Society, Box 122, Terminal "A," Toronto

Waterloo Historical Society, P. Fisher, Secretary, Public Library, Kitchener, Ont.

Welland County Historical Society, Louis Blake Duff, Secretary, 36 Niagara St., Welland, Ont.

Wellington County Historical Research Society, Mrs. W. D. Hodgkinson, Secretary, Arthur St., Guelph, Ont.

Wolfville Historical Society, Rosamond Archibald, Secretary, Wolfville, N.S.

Women's Canadian Club of St. John, c/o Mrs. J. D. MacLean, 127 King St. E., Saint John, N.B.

Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, Mrs. J. P. Macmillan, Secretary, 126 Fourth Ave., Ottawa

Women's Canadian Historical Society of Sarnia, Miss Bessie Symington, 173½ Front St., Sarnia, Ont.

Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, Mrs. Alan Jackson, Secretary, 62 Lawrence Ave. E., Toronto

Women's Wentworth Historical Society, Mrs. George Gage, Secretary, 248 Park St. S., Hamilton, Ont.

York Pioneer and Historical Society, Rev. T. W. Andrews, Assistant Secretary, 20 Watford Ave., Toronto

York-Sunbury Historical Society, G. Alvah Good, Secretary, 242 Regent St., Fredericton, N.B.

